80-1260

No.

Office-Supreme Court, U
FILED
JAN 21 1981
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS
CLERK

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1980

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, et al.,

Petitioners,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

SALVATORE R. MARTOCHE, ESQ.
Attorney for Petitioners
300 Statler Office Building
Buffalo, New York 14202
(716) 856-1010

Law Offices of
MARTOCHE AND FEUERSTEIN
Of Counsel

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. Are the constitutional claims of Thomas Leonhard barred by the statute of limitations?

II. Have the Leonhard children failed to state constitutional claims upon which relief can be granted?

III. Does the Eleventh Amendment bar all claims asserted against the state defendants?

IV. Are the Plaintiffs' federal tort claims barred by the two-year filing provision of 28 U.S.C. 2401(b)?

V. Have the Plaintiffs failed to state valid tort claims against the United States?

PARTIES

Plaintiffs-Petitioners:

Thomas S. Leonhard, Individually and as Parent and Legal Guardian of Michael Leonhard, An Infant, Stephan Leonhard, An Infant, and Karen Leonhard, An Infant

Defendants-Respondents:

United States of America; United States Department of Justice; the Hon. Griffin Bell and his predecessors in office to and including the Hon. John Mitchell, individually and in their official capacity; Thomas A. Kennelly, individually and in his official capacity; Gerald Shur, individually and in his official capacity; Benhamin R. Civiletti, individually and in his official capacity; The United States Marshals Service; Wayne B. Colburn, Director, and his predecessors in office to 1967, individually and in their official capacity; John Cameron, individually and in his official capacity; Five Unknown Agents of the United States Department of Justice, individually and in their official capacity; The New York State Department of Correctional Services; Benjamin Ward, and his predecessors in office to 1967, individually and in their official capacity; The New York State Board of Parole; Eugene Hammock, and his predecessors in office to 1967, individually and in their official capacity; The City of Buffalo; Samuel Giambrone, individually and in his official capacity; Pascal Calabrese, individually and in his official capacity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Questions Presented	*i*
Parties	*ii*
Table of Authorities	*iv*
Opinions Below	*vii*
Statement of Jurisdiction	*vii*
Constitutional Provisions and Statutes Involved	*vii*
Statement of the Case	1
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
I. Preliminary Statement	4
II. The Plaintiffs Have Stated Valid Constitutional and Federal Tort Claims Upon Which Relief Can Be Granted	5
III. The Claims of Thomas Leonhard and the Federal Tort Claims of All Plaintiffs are Not Time-Barred	11
IV. All Claims Asserted Against the State Defendants are Not Barred by the Eleventh Amendment	17
CONCLUSION	18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:	Page
Adickes v. S. H. Kress and Company, 398 U.S. 144 (1970) .	10
Armstrong v. Manzo, 380 U.S. 545 (1965)	7
Baker v. F & F Investment, 420 F.2d 1254 (7th Cir.), cert. den. 400 U.S. 821 (1970)	14
Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971)	11
Board of Regents v. Tomanio, ___ U.S. ___ 100 S.Ct. 1790 (1980)	15
Briley v. State of California, 564 F.2d 849 (9th Cir. 1977) .	15
Caban v. Mohammed, 441 U.S. 380 (1979)	7
Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41 (1957)	4
Donaldson v. O'Connor, 493 F.2d 507 (5th Cir. 1974), vacated on other grounds, 422 U.S. 563 (1975)	13
Ex parte Young, 209 U.S. 123 (1908)	17, 18
Fonda v. Paulsen, 46 App.Div.2d 540 (3rd Dept. 1975) . . .	16
Gomez v. Toledo, ___ U.S. ___, 100 S.Ct. 1920 (1980) . . .	10
Griffin v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, 377 U.S. 218 (1964)	18
Harper v. Union Savings Association, 429 F.Supp. 1254 (N.D. Oh. 1977)	14
Holdridge v. Heyer-Schulte Corporation of Santa Barbara, 440 F.Supp. 1088 (N.D. N.Y. 1977)	16
Jenkins v. McKeithen, 395 U.S. 411 (1969)	4
Kaiser v. Cahn, 510 F.2d 282 (2nd Cir. 1974)	11
Kossick v. United Fruit Co., 365 U.S. 731 (1961)	4

	Page
Landman v. Royster, 354 F.Supp. 1302 (E.D. Va. 1973). . .	14
Lavellee v. Listi, 611 F.2d 1129 (5th Cir. 1980)	11, 14
Lee v. Board of Regents of State Colleges, 441 F.2d 1257 (7th Cir. 1971)	18
Leonhard v. Mitchell, 473 F.2d 709 (2nd Cir.), cert. den. 412 U.S. 949 (1973)	3
Martinez v. California, 444 U.S. 277 (1980)	9
Monell v. Department of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658 (1978)	10
Moore v. City of East Cleveland, 431 U.S. 494 (1977).	5
Parham v. J. R., 442 U.S. 584 (1979).	7, 8, 9
Prince v. Massachusetts, 321 U.S. 158 (1944)	5
Quilloin v. Walcott, 434 U.S. 246 (1978).	5
Regan v. Sullivan, 557 F.2d 300 (2nd Cir. 1977)	11
Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232 (1974).	4, 17
Stanley v. Illinois, 405 U.S. 645 (1972)	6
Stuebig v. Hammell, 446 F.Supp. 31 (M.D. Pa. 1977).	14
United States v. Kubrick, 444 U.S. 111 (1979).	14
Statutes:	
28 U.S.C. §1331.	3
28 U.S.C. §1343.	3
28 U.S.C. §1346(a), (b)	3
28 U.S.C. §2201.	18
28 U.S.C. §2202.	18

	Page
28 U.S.C. §2401(b)	14
28 U.S.C. §2674	3, 9
42 U.S.C. §1983	3, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15
Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, P.L. 91-452, Title V, §§501-504, 84 Stat. 933 (1970)	3
Constitutional Provisions:	
Amendment I	3
Amendment IV	3
Amendment V	3
Amendment IX	3
Amendment XI	17, 18
Amendment XIV	3
Miscellaneous:	
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)	4

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeals, dated August 28, 1980 is not officially reported and is printed in Appendix A, at p. A-8 et seq.

The opinion of the District Court, dated September 21, 1979 dismissing the claims against the federal defendants and the City of Buffalo, is not officially reported and is printed in Appendix A at p. A-64 et seq. The letter of Judge Burke, dated November 19, 1979, amending this opinion to include the claims against Samuel Giambrone, is printed in Appendix A at p. A-75.

The opinion of the District Court dismissing the claims against the state defendants, dated October 25, 1979 is not officially reported and is printed in Appendix A at p. A-72 et seq.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Court of Appeals sought to be reviewed is dated, and was entered, August 28, 1980. A motion was made on behalf of the petitioners for an extension of time to file a petition for rehearing and was granted by the Court of Appeals on September 24, 1980. The petition for rehearing was denied by the Court of Appeals on October 24, 1980. The orders and judgments referred to are printed in Appendix A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES INVOLVED

Amendments I, IV, V, IX and IV, because of their length, are printed in Appendix B.

Likewise, 28 U.S.C. §§2401, 2674, 42 U.S.C. §1983 and Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, P.L. 91-452, Title V, §§501-504, 84 Stat. 933 (1970), because of their length are printed in Appendix B.

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1980

No.

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, et al.,

Petitioners,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This action arises out of events beginning on September 29, 1966 when a decree was granted by the Supreme Court of the State of New York dissolving the marriage between Rochelle Leonhard and the plaintiff, Thomas Leonhard. By virtue of this decree, custody of the Leonhard's minor children, Michael, Karen and Stephan was granted to the mother, with visitation rights to the plaintiff, Thomas Leonhard. Prior to the divorce, the mother became involved with, and in February, 1966, purportedly married Pascal Calabrese. The marriage was bigamous because they married before the finalization of the Leonhards' divorce.

Calabrese was convicted of armed robbery sometime late in 1966 and was sentenced to a lengthy term of imprisonment in a

New York State correctional institution. Thereafter, through the continuous efforts of Sgt. Samuel Giambrone, of the Buffalo Police Department, Calabrese was introduced to members of the United States Justice Department's Organized Crime Task Force in Buffalo, New York. In exchange for Calabrese's anticipated testimony against certain reputed organized crime figures, agents of this department promised Calabrese his release from prison, as well as a new identity for himself, the mother and the children of the plaintiff, Thomas Leonhard.

Prior to Calabrese's testimony, he was relocated from the New York State prison to federal custody. In August, 1967, without any regard for the interests of Thomas Leonhard, the mother and children were taken into the custody of the Justice Department. Calabrese's testimony was then used to secure the desired convictions, and as agreed, in 1968, with the assistance and cooperation of the New York State Department of Corrections and Parole Board, he was discharged from the term of imprisonment. Thereafter, and continuously until 1975, the Justice Department through the United States Marshals Service, provided Calabrese, the mother and the three plaintiff children with new identities, and kept their location and whereabouts secret.

Upon becoming aware of his children's absence when attempting to visit them, Thomas Leonhard attempted to learn of his children's whereabouts and have their location revealed by the Justice Department. Because he was unsuccessful in obtaining this information voluntarily, in June, 1971, he began a state court proceeding and obtained an order modifying the divorce decree; by the order he was granted custody of his children. Thereafter, a mandamus action against various agents and departments of the federal government was initiated in the United States District Court for the Western District of New York (Civil Action No. 1971-359), requesting that the Court order the defendants to disclose the whereabouts of his children. That Court, without a hearing, denied the requested relief; its decision

was affirmed on appeal. *Leonhard v. Mitchell*, 473 F.2d 709 (2nd Cir.) cert. den. 412 U.S. 949 (1973). In July of 1975, more than eight years after they were taken from him, Thomas Leonhard located and saw his children again, without any assistance from the defendants herein.

This action was brought by Thomas Leonhard in the United States District Court for the Western District of New York (Civil Action No. 78-357), individually and as parent and legal guardian of Michael, Karen and Stephan Leonhard. It alleges that the three classes of defendants, individually and in their official capacity, acting in concert, and beyond the scope of their authority, caused the breakup of the relationship between the plaintiffs as father and children. It further alleges that by separating and concealing the children from their father, the defendants have deprived the parties of their constitutional rights to family integrity; the plaintiff, Thomas Leonhard's constitutional rights to raise, rear, nurture, educate and bring up according to one's religion and conversely, the plaintiffs, Michael, Karen and Stephan Leonhards' rights to be raised, reared, educated, supported, maintained and brought up according to one's religion. Relief was partially based upon the First, Fourth, Fifth, Ninth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. §1983. Jurisdiction over these claims was conferred by 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1343. Other relief was founded upon Title V of the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, §§ 501-504, P.L.91-452 (1970), the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. §2674) and state tort law, with jurisdiction conferred by 28 U.S.C. §§1346(a), (b) and pendent jurisdiction. Relief in the nature of declaratory judgment was also requested.

After all but one of the defendants served with process so moved, the District Court, by way of two opinions, ordered the dismissal of the actions in favor of all of the defendants. The dismissal was affirmed on appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and this petition follows.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

I.
Preliminary Statement

In presenting the arguments contained in the present petition, it is stressed to this Court that the Court of Appeals reviewed and affirmed orders entered upon motions to dismiss the plaintiffs' complaint. The Court of Appeals in its review of the District Court's action, misapplied and ignored the basic rules of law applicable to the determination of a motion to dismiss by not assuming the allegations contained in the complaint to be true and by construing the allegations unfavorably to the plaintiffs.

This lawsuit is complex, involving eight years of continuous conduct by the defendants at three levels of government. Aware of this, the plaintiffs endeavored to ensure that their complaint complied as closely as possible with the mandate of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) in that it contains "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief..." In opposition to the motion to dismiss, the plaintiffs were entitled to have the allegations in the complaint taken as true as well as construed liberally in their favor. *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974); *Jenkins v. McKeithen*, 395 U.S. 411, 421-22 (1969); *Kossick v. United Fruit Co.*, 365 U.S. 731, 732 (1961).

The applicable principles were concisely stated in *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46, 47 (1957):

> [T]he accepted rule [is] that a complaint should not be dismissed for failure to state a claim unless it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief... the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not require a claimant to set out in detail the facts upon which he bases his claim. To the contrary, all the Rules require is 'short and plain statement of the claim' that will give the defendant fair notice of what the plaintiff's

> claim is and the grounds upon which it rests [footnotes omitted].

As will appear in the following discussions, the Court of Appeals violated each of these principles in their affirmance of the District Court. Not only was the plaintiffs' complaint construed against them, but without the reception of any evidence, allegations in the complaint were ignored and certain facts contained in the allegations found not to exist by the Court. As will become apparent, after viewing the plaintiffs' complaint as it should be under the above principles, the judgment of the Court of Appeals should be reversed.

II.

The Plaintiffs Have Stated Valid Constitutional and Federal Tort Claims Upon Which Relief Can Be Granted

After stating that defenses based upon the statute of limitations and collateral estoppel did not bar the claims asserted on behalf of the Leonhard children against the federal defendants, the Court of Appeals held their claims were properly dismissed for failure to state a cause of action. This rationale was used as an alternative ground to affirm the dismissal of the claims made against the state and city defendants. Contrary to the Court of Appeals' view of this lawsuit, valid claims upon which relief can be granted have been advanced on behalf of Michael, Karen and Stephan Leonhard.

As the Court of Appeals stated, it has been "recognized on numerous occasions that the relationship between parent and child is constitutionally protected." *Quilloin v. Walcott*, 434 U.S. 246, 255 (1978). This relationship gives rise to rights worthy of protection on behalf of the parent as well as on behalf of the children. *Moore v. City of East Cleveland*, 431 U.S. 494, 503-6 (plurality opinion) (1977), and cases cited in *Prince v. Massachusetts*, 321 U.S. 158 (1944) at pages 165-166. The Court of Appeals attempts to minimize the government's involvement in

the relationship between Thomas Leonhard and his children by emphasizing the divorce between Rochelle and Thomas Leonhard, by which Rochelle was awarded custody of the children. The fact remains, however, that the children were separated from, and the relationship with their father destroyed by the actions of the defendants.

The Court of Appeals states in its opinion "[t]he most critical fact in determining whether the rights of the children were violated is the fact that Rochelle had sole custody of them." The Court reads too much into the fact that the Leonhards' divorce decree granted custody of the children to Rochelle. Far from giving Rochelle complete and absolute control over the future of the children, the grant of custody to her was merely a recognition of the situation at that time. Thomas Leonhard, being employed at the time of the divorce, would have been unable to take care of the day-to-day needs of three children between the ages of three to seven. He was, however, ordered in the decree to pay child support and provide health insurance. In recognition of his absolute rights to see and visit with his children, he was granted weekend and holiday visitation rights. Further, in June of 1971, the New York State Supreme Court modified the original divorce decree to award the plaintiff custody of the children, a fact wholly ignored by the Court of Appeals in its decision.

As Rochelle had custody of the children at the time Calabrese was originally dealing with the Government, the Court of Appeals views her consent as sufficient to cut off any later claims on behalf of the children that they were deprived of their natural father. Although never presented with a set of facts such as these, this Court has never held that a natural parent's rights in his children can be severed completely without at least some showing of unfitness or an opportunity to be heard. For example, in *Stanley v. Illinois*, 405 U.S. 645 (1972), the Court held that an unwed natural father must be given a hearing on his fitness as a

parent before he is deprived of the custody of his children after the death of their mother. See also, *Caban v. Mohammed*, 441 U.S. 380 (1979). Similarly, in *Armstrong v. Manzo*, 380 U.S. 545 (1965), the Court held that a natural father who was divorced from the mother of their child must be given notice and an opportunity to be heard before the child is adopted by the man whom the mother had remarried.

These cases acquire even greater significance when it is considered that the children here were *de facto* adopted by Calabrese, a convicted violent felony offender. Just as an adoption cuts off all rights and duties of a natural parent, the removal and concealment of the children at the instigation of and by the government, violated Thomas Leonhard's rights regarding his children and made it impossible for him to exercise his parental rights and responsibilities. By virtue of the same governmental intrusion, the rights of Thomas Leonhard's three children were cut off just as drastically.

Because the above cases deal on their face with the rights of the father, the children in the instant case are *in loco parentis*. Parents traditionally have been entrusted with the responsibility of taking whatever action is necessary to preserve the rights of their children. Under the circumstances of this case, it cannot be expected that Rochelle Leonhard would have pressed the children's rights not to be severed from the natural father. Only by including Thomas Leonhard as a part of the decision making process to remove and conceal his children, would the children have been provided with a true advocate for their rights. This principle was implicitly recognized by the Court of Appeals in footnote 28 of its opinion where it states: "[c]ertainly if both Rochelle and [Thomas] Leonhard had consented [to the children's removal and concealment] the children would have no claim."

The Court of Appeals relies heavily on *Parham v. J.R.*, 442 U.S. 584 (1979), to support its conclusions regarding the sufficiency of

Rochelle Leonhard's consent for the removal and concealment of the children and the necessity for notice and a hearing before removal. Involved in *Parham* was the issue of what procedures are constitutionally mandated before minors can be confined to mental institutions. The Court of Appeals, by noting that one parent who had custody of a minor had consented to the child's confinement in such an institution, holds that Rochelle Leonhard's consent alone was sufficient consent on behalf of the Leonhard children to their concealment and removal. First, the situation in *Parham* and the present case are completely different. The fact that one parent's consent is sufficient for purposes of medical treatment is surely not enough to allow a mother to completely remove and conceal children from their father. Secondly, there is no indication in *Parham* that the other parent opposed the admission of the child to the institution or that if that parent, in fact, so opposed, could not have petitioned for the child's removal.

Contrary to the Court of Appeals' assertion that *Parham* holds that minors have no right at all to a hearing before being committed to a mental institution, in *Parham* it was held "that some kind of inquiry should be made by a 'neutral factfinder' to determine if the statutory requirements for admission are satisfied." *Parham, supra*, at 606.

Here, the plaintiff children should never have been removed and concealed from their natural father without notice and a hearing. Here, the defendants acted without the slightest consideration for the effects upon the children's relationship with their natural father, balanced against the need for their removal. The Court of Appeals also stated that the nature of the risks of retaliation the children were exposed to should Calabrese be located made it impractical to hold any kind of hearing before they were removed. A review of the facts shows that no such risks even existed at the time. Rochelle Leonhard, in the affidavit relied upon so heavily in other contexts by the

Court of Appeals, states that she was informed by agents of the federal government and city that she and the children were never in any danger as a result of Calabrese's testimony. Secondly, any harm the children may have been exposed to was only as a result of the defendants' agreeing to provide protection for Calabrese in exchange for his testimony.

The Court of Appeals also states that "[t]he liberty interest in *Parham* was clearly more substantial than the interests of the children here in the possibility of periodic visits from their father." The trouble with this statement is that it confuses distinctly different matters. The needed treatment with its attendant confinement in an institution in *Parham* by definition could not have been provided in a home setting. At the least, in *Parham*, the natural parents had an opportunity to participate in their children's treatment and were not completely severed from them.

The same reasoning was used by the Court of Appeals in dismissing the plaintiffs' federal tort claims and the children's constitutional claims. Upon consideration of the above, the plaintiffs have likewise stated valid causes of action under the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. §2674.

With regard to the state defendants, the Court of Appeals held that because the plaintiffs' complaint alleges their sole actions consisted of releasing Calabrese from prison in violation of state law, a claim has not been stated against them as their actions are too attenuated from the removal and concealment of the children and cites *Martinez v. California*, 444 U.S. 277 (1980). However, as opposed to the injury in *Martinez* which was almost completely unconnected with the lawful parole release decision; in this case, the decision to release Calabrese by the state defendants was done in contravention of state law and in full cooperation with the federal and city defendants in the plan to provide new identities and residences for Calabrese, the mother and the three plaintiff children. Indeed, it was not until

Calabrese had completed his part of the bargain by testifying that the state defendants released him, thereby enabling the federal government to fulfill what it had promised. Such involvement by the state defendants provides an adequate basis on which to assert a claim on behalf of the children. Cf. *Adickes v. S. H. Kress and Company*, 398 U.S. 144, 152 (1970).

As an alternative ground, the Court of Appeals affirmed the dismissal of the claims against the City of Buffalo because the plaintiffs did not allege that an official policy, regulation or custom was violated as required before liability may attach to that municipality pursuant to *Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978). The plaintiff's complaint does allege that Samuel Giambrone and others unknown, while employees of the police department of the City of Buffalo, acted in conjunction with the federal and state defendants in securing the release of Calabrese from prison and then removing and concealing the Leonhard children. Cooperation by a supervisory city police officer (Sgt. Giambrone) with federal and state law enforcement officials is a "custom or policy" of the City of Buffalo. Moreover, this Court has never held that a policy, custom or regulation must be pleaded in order to state a valid claim under 42 U.S.C. §1983, rather, it must be proven.

> By the plain terms of §1983, two — and only two — allegations are required in order to state a cause of action under that statute. First, the plaintiff must allege that some person has deprived him of a federal right. Second, he must allege that the person who has deprived him of that right acted under color of state or territorial law.

Gomez v. Toledo, ___ U.S. ___, ___, 100 S.Ct. 1920, 1923 (1980). As in *Gomez*, the instant plaintiffs have alleged all that is necessary in order to state a valid cause of action against the City of Buffalo.

Of particular significance in the context of this portion of the Court of Appeals' dismissal is the fact that defendant Sgt.

Samuel Giambrone never even moved to dismiss the complaint — rather, he answered. Notwithstanding this, the District Court and the Court of Appeals dismissed plaintiffs' claims against the answering defendant.

III.

The Claims of Thomas Leonhard and the Federal Tort Claims of All Plaintiffs are Not Time-Barred

The constitutional claims of Thomas Leonhard against the federal defendants are predicated upon the principles articulated in *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). Similar claims are asserted against the state and city defendants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983. The applicable statute of limitations for the *Bivens* claims has been held to be either three or six years in New York. *Regan v. Sullivan*, 557 F.2d 300 (2nd Cir. 1977). A three-year period of limitations governs the §1983 claims. *Kaiser v. Cahn*, 510 F.2d 282 (2nd Cir. 1974).

Thomas Leonhard does not contest the length of the applicable period of limitations, but rather, will show that the Court of Appeals incorrectly determined its accrual; the point in time from which the period should be calculated. For present purposes, it will be assumed that a uniform three-year period applies to the constitutional claims asserted against all three groups of defendants.

As the Court of Appeals recognized, notwithstanding the fact that state law is looked to for the applicable period of limitations for these claims, federal law determines when the causes of action accrued. See, e.g., *Kaiser v. Cahn, supra*, at 285; *Lavellee v. Listi*, 611 F.2d 1129, 1130 (5th Cir. 1980). The plaintiffs' complaint was filed on June 30, 1978. It alleges that both the federal and city defendants participated in actively removing and concealing Thomas Leonhard's children from him for a continuous period from August, 1967, until July, 1975. It is also

alleged that these defendants not only initially unlawfully removed the children, but that they continued to violate Thomas Leonhard's constitutional rights in thereafter actively concealing the children. The children were concealed from Thomas Leonhard up until July, 1975. As the complaint was filed in June, 1978, this action was clearly commenced within three years of the accrual of the cause of action.

The Court of Appeals, however, instead of viewing the allegations of removal and concealment in the complaint as true for purposes of the motion to dismiss, held that because no "overt acts" were alleged as late as 1975, the claims were time-barred. The Court also went beyond the complaint and relied upon an affidavit of Rochelle Leonhard submitted in opposition to the motion to dismiss to determine that, because she details no conduct of the defendants past 1970, Thomas Leonhard's claims accrued at the latest in 1970.

First of all, by utilizing the method of review it did, the Court violated the basic principle that the allegations in the complaint are to be construed liberally in favor of the plaintiff and injected an "overt acts" pleading requirement without affording Thomas Leonhard the right to amend his complaint. Secondly, the Court ignores other paragraphs of Rochelle's affidavit in which she relates how the federal and city defendants participated in visits by herself and the children to the Buffalo area between 1967 and 1975. At the least, this affidavit supports the complaint's allegations that the defendants concealed the children from Thomas Leonhard until 1975.

Even if, upon the trial of this action, it is shown that the defendants did nothing past 1970, Thomas Leonhard's causes of action would still be valid. Because these defendants concededly took an active part in removing and concealing the children, even if their active participation ceased earlier than 1975, they cannot escape liability. Once the period of concealment began, it was only logical and natural that it continue, even if the

defendants ceased their active roles. There appears to be no reason why the defendants should not be held liable for the logical and natural consequences of their actions. Of course, there may come a point in time when the consequences of the removal and concealment become so far removed as to create a question of causation, but upon the present record, it cannot be said that this case falls within such an exception.

In the initial portion of its analysis, the Court of Appeals views the initial removal and concealment of the children as a potential cause of action on behalf of Thomas Leonhard, but states that the subsequent acts in support of the initial concealment should not give rise to new or renewed causes of action. In thus limiting the claims asserted by plaintiff, Thomas Leonhard, the Court of Appeals views the defendants' action in the wrong light. The defendants did not just remove the children and decide upon future action as the need arose, but rather, from the time of their initial acts up until July, 1975, the defendants acted in accordance with and in furtherance of their agreement with Calabrese, with the result that the father, Thomas Leonhard, was cut off from his children for this eight year period of time. Correctly viewed, the numerous actions of the defendants did not give rise to several individual causes of action, but rather were a continuous course of conduct which gave rise to a single cause of action.

Secondly, by characterizing the defendant's actions as it did, the Court of Appeals ignored the majority of contrary precedents. In contrast to the Court's holding, a number of other cases have held that continuous conduct violative of the Constitution gives rise to a continuing injury and a cause of action which accrues only upon the cessation of the wrongful conduct. Typical of this is *Donaldson v. O'Connor*, 493 F.2d 507, 529 (5th Cir. 1974), vacated on other grounds 422 U.S. 563 (1975), in which it was held that a cause of action under 42 U.S.C. §1983 for illegal confinement in a mental institution did not accrue until

the plaintiff had been released from the institution. Similarly, *Lavellee v. Listi, supra,* at 1132, holds that a §1983 claim for failure to provide medical care to a jailed individual does not accrue until the care is provided. Both of these cases characterize the conduct of the respective defendants as continuing as long as the condition of which the plaintiff complained was in existence. In a case of continuing injury, a plaintiff may recover for all damages caused by the defendant's course of conduct, even though the conduct predates the period of limitations. E.g., *Steubig v. Hammel,* 466 F.Supp. 31, 35 (M.D. Pa. 1977). See also, *Baker v. F & F Investment,* 420 F.2d 1191, 1200 (7th Cir.), cert. den. 400 U.S. 821 (1970); *Harper v. Union Savings Association,* 429 F.Supp. 1254, 1260 (N.D. Oh. 1977); *Landman v. Royster,* 354 F.Supp. 1302, 1315 (E.D. Va. 1973).

Just as in the above-cited cases, Thomas Leonhard's causes of action against the federal and city defendants did not accrue until he was reunited with his children; the time of the cessation of the defendants' course of conduct, or the natural and logical consequence of their prior actions. Because the date of the reunion (July 11, 1975) was less than three years prior to the filing of the summons and complaint in this action, the claims were timely commenced.

Similarly, because of the continuous nature of the injuries sustained, the federal tort claims of all the plaintiffs are timely because these claims were filed on June 27, 1977, within the two year period set forth in 28 U.S.C. §2401(b). Due to the continuing nature of the conduct and injuries in this case, the plaintiffs do not violate the construction of §2401(b) articulated in *United States v. Kubrick,* 444 U.S. 111 (1979). In *Kubrick,* the defendants' conduct had ceased much longer than two years before the claim was filed, while the conduct of the present defendants continued up until less than two years before the filing of these claims.

In addition to the above, the federal concealment doctrine likewise supports a July, 1975, accrual date for the constitutional claims of Thomas Leonhard. As articulated in the context of a claim under 42 U.S.C. §1983 in *Briley v. State of California*, 564 F.2d 849, 855 (9th Cir. 1977), "[t]he established rule, . . . , is that where a plaintiff has been injured by fraud or concealment and remains in ignorance of it without any fault or want of diligence on his part, the statutory period [of limitations] does not begin to run until *discovery* of the injury [citation omitted]."

Notwithstanding the fact that Thomas Leonhard knew his children had been taken from him in 1967, just as in a case of fraudulent concealment, the present defendants acted intentionally, in knowing disregard of Thomas Leonhard's rights in first removing his children and then refusing to disclose their whereabouts. Just as a successful plaintiff under this doctrine must act with diligence, Thomas Leonhard had at all times before his children were returned to him, actively sought their return, only to be frustrated in his efforts by the defendants. By recognizing the principles underlying this doctrine, and by their direct application, the actions of the present defendants should have been held to have barred the running of the statute of limitations against Thomas Leonhard until his children were returned to him.

With regard to the state defendants, the Court of Appeals held that because their sole actions were limited to releasing Calabrese from prison in 1968, the §1983 claims asserted against them by Thomas Leonhard were time barred. As this Court has recently held, a state's tolling provisions are borrowed together with its statute of limitations for claims under 42 U.S.C. §1983. *Board of Regents v. Tomanio*, ____ U.S. ____, ____, 100 S. Ct. 1790, 1795 (1980). Tolling principles under New York law operate to save a cause of action on behalf of a plaintiff who has been injured through the actions of a defendant, even though remote

in time, if those actions together with the subsequent conduct of other individuals caused the plaintiff's injuries.

Here, the state defendants acted in conjunction with the federal and city defendants in releasing Calabrese as part of the federal government's agreement to secrete Calabrese in exchange for his testimony. In doing so, the state defendants violated New York law concerning the release of individuals from prison. These defendants will also be shown to have acted with knowledge that their actions aided the removal of Thomas Leonhard's children from him. In fact, the state defendants had actual knowledge that Calabrese's marriage to Rochelle Leonhard was bigamous. As a result of their actions, these defendants should have reasonably foreseen the consequences of their actions, i.e., the removal and concealment of the children from Thomas Leonhard.

A tolling doctrine has been articulated by the state courts of New York which has been applied to actions analogous to those of the state defendants. In *Fonda v. Paulsen*, 46 App. Div. 2d 540, 545 (3rd Dept. 1975), it was held that a cause of action survived against a pathologist who could have reasonably foreseen that his findings would be relied upon by other physicians treating the plaintiff, notwithstanding the fact that the actions constituting his malpractice exceeded the statute of limitations. See also, *Holdridge v. Heyer-Schulte Corporation of Santa Barbara*, 440 F.Supp. 1088, 1099 (N.D.N.Y. 1977) (applying *Fonda, supra.*).

Under the principles mandating the application of New York's tolling provisions to the case at bar, because the actions of the state defendants could be reasonably foreseen to have aided in the removal and concealment of Thomas Leonhard's children from him, the claims asserted against them are not barred by the statute of limitations.

IV.

All Claims Asserted Against the State Defendants are Not Barred by the Eleventh Amendment

The complaint in this action names the New York State Department of Corrections, the New York State Board of Parole, Benjamin Ward, and his predecessors in office to 1967, and Eugene Hammock, and his predecessors in office to 1967, as defendants. Ward and Hammock are the directors of the Department of Corrections and the Parole Board respectively, and are sued in their official, as well as individual, capacities. One of the two grounds relied upon by the Court of Appeals in dismissing the claims of the three Leonhard children against these defendants is that the requests for damages were barred by the Eleventh Amendment. Presumably, had it not relied upon other reasoning, this rationale would have been used by the Court to dismiss the claims asserted against these defendants by Thomas Leonhard.

As far as its reasoning is articulated in its opinion, the Court of Appeals is correct in that the Eleventh Amendment bars the requests for damages from the state agencies and the individuals in their official capacities. For two reasons, however, the Court erred in dismissing all claims asserted against these defendants.

First, the individuals Ward, Hammock and their predecessors in office, are alleged to have exceeded and violated their statutory authority by cooperating with the Justice Department and in doing so, violated the constitutional rights of the plaintiffs. By virtue of this, these defendants have subjected themselves to personal liability, for which the Eleventh Amendment provides no protection.

As stated by this Court in *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232, 237 (1974), "since *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908), it has been settled that the Eleventh Amendment provides no shield for a state official confronted by a claim that he had deprived another

of a federal right under the color of state law." Therefore, as against Ward, Hammock and their predecessors in office, in their personal capacities, the plaintiffs have asserted valid claims.

Secondly, plaintiffs in their complaint requested a "judgment declaring unlawful the actions of defendants complained of herein". 28 U.S.C. §§2201, 2202. Because this request does not involve a demand for damages to be paid from the State's treasury, it likewise does not fall within the proscription of the Eleventh Amendment. Again, with reference to *Ex parte Young, supra*, this Court has stated "[i]t has been settled law since [*Young, supra*] that suits against state and county officials to enjoin them from invading constitutional rights are not forbidden by the Eleventh Amendment." *Griffin v. County School Board of Prince Edward County*, 377 U.S. 218, 228 (1964).

As most, if not all, injunctions involve a preliminary finding of unlawful conduct, even though the instant plaintiffs do not request injunctive relief against the state defendants, their request for a declaratory judgment is maintainable notwithstanding the Eleventh Amendment. See, e.g., *Lee v. Board of Regents of State Colleges*, 441 F.2d 1257, 1260 (7th Cir. 1971).

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, the Court should grant this petition for certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

SALVATORE R. MARTOCHE, ESQ.
Attorney for Petitioners
300 Statler Office Building
Buffalo, New York 14202
(716) 856-1010

Law Offices of
MARTOCHE AND FEUERSTEIN
Of Counsel

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 21 1981
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

80-1260
No.

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1980

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, et al.,

Petitioners,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Respondents.

Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Second Circuit

PETITIONERS' APPENDIX

SALVATORE R. MARTOCHE, ESQ.
Attorney for Petitioners
300 Statler Office Building
Buffalo, New York 14202
(716) 856-1010

Law Offices of
MARTOCHE AND FEUERSTEIN
Of Counsel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

APPENDIX A
Opinions, Orders and Judgments of the
United States Court of Appeals
for the Second Circuit
and
District Court for the Western District
of New York

Order of United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit, Dated October 24, 1980 ..... A-1

Notice of Motion and Order of United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit, Dated September 9, 1980 .... A-3

Order of United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit, Dated August 28, 1980 ..... A-6

Opinion of United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit A-8

Order of United States District Court Western District of New York, Dated November 10, 1980 ..... A-61

Corrected Judgment of United States District Court Western District of New York, Dated November 10, 1980 ..... A-62

Judgment of United States District Court Western District of New York, Dated September 24, 1979 ..... A-63

Opinion of United States District Court Western District of New York, Dated September 21, 1979 ..... A-64

Judgment of United States District Court Western District of New York, Dated October 29, 1979 ..... A-71

Page

Opinion of United States District Court Western District of New York, Dated October 25, 1979 ..... A-72

Letter of Hon. Harold P. Burke, Dated November 19, 1979 ..... A-75

APPENDIX B

Constitutional Provisions and Statutes Involved B-1

APPENDIX A

Opinions, Orders and Judgments of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

and

District Court for the Western District of New York

APPENDIX A
Order of United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit
Dated October 24, 1980

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals, in and for the Second Circuit, held at the United States Court House, in the City of New York, on the 24th day of October, one thousand nine hundred and eighty.

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, et al.,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees,

and

PASCAL CALABRESE,

Defendant.

79-6218

A petition for rehearing containing a suggestion that the action be reheard in banc having been filed herein by counsel for the plaintiff-appellant, Thomas E. Leonard,

Upon consideration by the panel that heard the appeal, it is

Ordered that said petition for rehearing is DENIED.

It is further noted that the suggestion for rehearing in banc has been transmitted to the judges of the court in regular active service and to any other judge on the panel that heard the appeal

APPENDIX A
Order of United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit
Dated October 24, 1980

and that no such judge has requested that a vote be taken thereon.

/s/ A. DANIEL FUSARO
A. Daniel Fusaro
Clerk

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
SECOND CIRCUIT
FILED
OCT 24 1980
A. DANIEL FUSARO, CLERK

APPENDIX A
Notice of Motion and Order of United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit, Dated September 9, 1980

Docket Number 79-6218
NOTICE OF MOTION

for extension of time to file Petition for Rehearing en banc.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, ET AL.

vs.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL.

MOTION BY:

ALAN R. FEUERSTEIN, (716) 856-1010

Has opposing counsel consented? No.

Has service been effected? Yes.

Is oral argument desired? No.
(Substantive motions only)

Requested return date: 9/12/80
(See Second Circuit Rule 27(b))

Date of argument of appeal, if scheduled: January, 1980

Judge or agency whose order is being appealed:

OPPOSING COUNSEL:
ANTHONY J. STEINMEYER, (202) 633-5108; COBBY SHERIFF, (212) 488-3444; ANTHONY C. VACARRO (716) 855-4343

Brief statement of the relief requested: Extension of time to file petition for Rehearing en banc.

APPENDIX A

Notice of Motion and Order of United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit, Dated September 9, 1980

Previous requests for similar relief and disposition: none

Statement of the issue(s) presented by this motion: delay in receipt of the opinion of the panel of this Court as necessitating an extension of time for the Appellant to file petition for a rehearing en banc.

Brief statement of the facts *(with page references to the moving papers)*: As of 9/5/80, the appellant has not received a copy of the opinion rendered by a panel of this Court on the above-captioned action, even though the same was entered on August 28, 1980. Appellant has made several attempts to obtain a copy of this opinion, both through this Court, and other sources, without success. A copy of the opinion is necessary for the appellant to prepare his petition for rehearing en banc.

Summary of the argument *(with page references to the moving papers)*: As of 9/5/80, more than one week after it had been entered by a panel of this Court, the appellant has not yet received a copy of this Court's opinion, affirming the District Court's Orders in the above-captioned action. Because of the complexity of the issues involved in this case, and the length of the said opinion, it is necessary that the appellant have a copy of the same before preparing this petition for rehearing en banc. As the 14-day period for filing petition for rehearing will soon pass without the appellant having received a copy of this Court's opinion, it is respectfully requested that this Court extend the time in which the appellant may file his petition.

The return date requested is a product of the time limits involved in the petition for rehearing. (Please refer to attached affidavit)

Date: September 5, 1980

/s/ ALAN R. FEUERSTEIN
Alan R. Feuerstein

APPENDIX A
Notice of Motion and Order of United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit, Dated September 9, 1980

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion for leave to file today a petition for rehearing be and it hereby is granted.

/s/ AMALYA L. KEARSE
Hon. Amalya L. Kearse, CJ
Circuit Judge
Date: September 24, 1980

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
SECOND CIRCUIT
FILED
SEP 9, 1980
A. DANIEL FUSARO, CLERK

APPENDIX A
Order of United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit Dated August 28, 1980

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE
SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated Term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the United States Courthouse in the City of New York, on the twenty-eighth day of August, one thousand nine hundred and eighty.

Present:

HON. HENRY J. FRIENDLY
HON. WALTER R. MANSFIELD
HON. AMALYA L. KEARSE, C.JJ.

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, Individually, and THOMAS S. LEONHARD, As Natural Parent and Legal Guardian of: MICHAEL LEONHARD, An Infant, STEPHAN LEONHARD, An Infant, and KAREN LEONHARD, An Infant,

Plaintiff-Appellants,

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; et. al.

79-6218

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of record from the United States District Court for the Western District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

APPENDIX A
Order of United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit
Dated August 28, 1980

ON CONSIDERATION WHEREOF, it is now hereby ordered, adjudged, and decreed that the orders of said District Court be and they hereby are affirmed without costs in accordance with the opinion of this court.

A. DANIEL FUSARO, Clerk
/s/ ARTHUR HELLER
by: Arthur Heller, Deputy Clerk

A true copy,
/s/ A. DANIEL FUSARO
Clerk

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
SECOND CIRCUIT
FILED
AUG 28 1980
A. DANIEL FUSARO, CLERK

APPENDIX A
Opinion of United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

No. 658—September Term, 1979

(Argued January 18, 1980 Decided August 28, 1980)

Docket No. 79-6218

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, Individually, and THOMAS S. LEONHARD, as Natural Parent and Legal Guardian of: MICHAEL LEONHARD, an Infant, STEPHAN LEONHARD, an Infant, and KAREN LEONHARD, an Infant,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

—v.—

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; HON. GRIFFIN BELL, and His Predecessors in Office, to and Including HON. JOHN MITCHELL, Individually and in their Official Capacity; THOMAS A. KENNELLY, Individually and in His Official Capacity; GERALD SHUR, Individually and in His Official Capacity; BENJAMIN R. CIVILETTI, Individually and in his Official Capacity; THE UNITED STATES MARSHAL'S SERVICE; WAYNE B. COLBURN, Individually and in his Official Capacity; FIVE UNKNOWN AGENTS OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Individually and in their Official Capacity; JOHN CAMERON, Individually and in His Official Capacity; THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES; BENJAMIN

WARD, and his Predecessors in Office from 1967, Individually and in Their Official Capacity; THE NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF PAROLE; EUGENE HAMMOCK, and His Predecessors in Office from 1967, Individually and in Their Official Capacity; THE CITY OF BUFFALO; SAMUEL GIAMBRONE, Individually and in His Official Capacity,

Defendants-Appellees,

—and—

PASCAL CALABRESE, Individually and in His Official Capacity,

Defendant.

B e f o r e :

FRIENDLY, MANSFIELD and KEARSE,
Circuit Judges.

Appeal from orders of the United States District Court for the Western District of New York, Harold P. Burke, *Judge*, dismissing complaint for damages resulting from separation and concealment of the three infant plaintiffs from their father.

Affirmed.

ALAN R. FEUERSTEIN, Buffalo, N.Y. (Martoche *and* Feuerstein, Buffalo, N.Y., on the brief), *for Plaintiffs-Appellants.*

APPENDIX A

Opinion of United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit

ANTHONY J. STEINMEYER, Attorney, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. (Richard J. Arcara, United States Attorney for the Western District of New York, Alice Daniel, Assistant Attorney General, on the brief), *for the United States and other federal Defendants-Appellees.*

GERALD RYAN, Assistant Attorney General (Robert Abrams, Attorney General of the State of New York, Cobby J. Shereff and Deborah L. Wolikow, Law Apprentices, on the brief), *for the New York State Department of Correctional Services and other state Defendants-Appellees.*

ANTHONY C. VACCARO, Assistant Corporation Counsel, Buffalo, N.Y. (Joseph P. McNamara, Corporation Counsel, on the brief), *for Defendants-Appellees City of Buffalo and Samuel Giambrone.*

KEARSE, *Circuit Judge:*

Thomas Leonhard ("Leonhard"), suing in his own behalf and as legal guardian of his three children Michael, Stephan, and Karen Leonhard, appeal from the summary dismissal of their action, commenced in 1978 in the United States District Court for the Western District of New York, seeking money damages for the violation of his and his children's constitutional rights and for torts committed against the children

resulting from the separation and concealment of the children from Leonhard in 1967. Named as defendants were the United States and various federal agencies and officials (the "federal defendants"), certain New York State agencies and officials (the "state defendants"), the City of Buffalo and Samuel Giambrone, a former Buffalo police officer (the "city defendants"), and one Pascal Calabrese. The three groups of defendants moved to dismiss on various grounds including collateral estoppel, statute of limitations, governmental immunity, and failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

After hearing argument, the district court, Harold P. Burke, *Judge*, entered orders dismissing the complaint against all of the defendants, except Calabrese who had not been served with process. Plaintiffs appeal from those orders. The federal defendants argue that the appeal should be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction because the claims against Calabrese were never dismissed and because no judgment was actually entered in favor of Giambrone.

For the reasons set forth below, we hold that we have jurisdiction and that all claims were properly dismissed.

I. *THE FACTUAL BACKGROUND*

In 1966, Leonhard and his wife Rochelle were divorced. The decree, entered by the State Supreme Court for Erie County, New York, awarded custody of their three children to Rochelle; Leonhard was given visitation rights.[1] Early in 1967, Rochelle married

---

1 The decree was entered in *Leonhard v. Leonhard*, No. C-94314 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. Erie Co. Sept. 29, 1966), and provides in relevant part:

(footnote continued on next page)

defendant Calabrese and she and the children lived with him in Buffalo. Shortly thereafter, however, Calabrese began serving a five-year term of imprisonment in a New York state prison. In early 1967, members of the Buffalo Strike Force for Organized Crime, a part of the United States Department of Justice, learned from defendant Giambrone, a detective in the Buffalo Police Department, that Calabrese might have useful information on organized crime. It developed that Calabrese was willing to testify against certain members of organized crime, but only if the Strike Force agreed to protect him, Rochelle and the children, and to relocate them with new identities. The Strike Force officials agreed to this and later in 1967 arranged Calabrese's transfer to a federal prison and moved Rochelle and the children to a military reservation. Leonhard was not consulted.

In the fall of 1967 Calabrese testified as a government witness in a successful prosecution of organized crime members. As a result of this cooperation, the New York State Parole Board granted him parole in February 1968. Defendant Kennelly, a Justice Department attorney working with the Buffalo Strike

---

[It is] ORDERED that the plaintiff [Rochelle] have custody and control of the children of the marriage, MICHAEL LEONHARD, KAREN LEONHARD and STEPHEN LEONHARD, and it is further

ORDERED that the defendant [Thomas] be permitted visitation rights with the children on Sundays between ten and six and three days during the summer vacation of the defendant and on alternate holidays agreed upon between the parties, and it is further

ORDERED that the defendant pay to the plaintiff the sum of forty-five dollars ($45.00) per week for the support and maintenance of the children of the marriage and defendant to provide Blue Shield/Blue Cross.

Force, arranged for Calabrese, Rochelle, and the children to be moved to a new and secret residence. Under Kennelly's direction, the government provided new identities and supporting credentials for the entire family and secured employment for Calabrese. The family later relocated again on its own initiative; at that point only Kennelly knew their identities and location.

The effect of all of this was that Leonhard was left without any knowledge of his children's whereabouts. He first tried to locate his children in August 1967. In mid-1969 Leonhard's attorney contacted Kennelly to attempt to locate the children. Kennelly refused to reveal the whereabouts of Rochelle and the children, but agreed to forward correspondence between Rochelle and Leonhard. Rochelle refused to permit Leonhard to see the children even at a neutral location, for fear they would reveal their new identities. Leonhard finally commenced an action in New York Supreme Court to modify the divorce decree and award him custody. He attempted to serve process on Rochelle via Kennelly, but Kennelly, who was not Rochelle's attorney, refused to accept service or to forward the papers. When Rochelle learned of the suit, from sources undisclosed, she warned Kennelly that if he in any way revealed her whereabouts she and the children would disappear without informing even Kennelly of their new identities and location. In June 1971, by default, the New York court granted Leonhard custody of the three children.

A. *The Prior Action ("Leonhard I")*

In July 1971, Leonhard commenced an action in the United States District Court for the Western District of New York against Kennelly, John Mitchell (then

Attorney General), and other officials of the Department of Justice. Alleging that the defendants had secreted his three children and given them new identities, and that he now had custody, Leonhard sought relief in the nature of mandamus, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1361 (1970), to compel the defendants to disclose the whereabouts and new identities of the children. No damages were sought, and Leonhard sued only on his own behalf; his children were not parties to the action.

The district court denied mandamus and the judgment was affirmed in *Leonhard v. Mitchell ("Leonhard I")*, 473 F.2d 709 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 412 U.S. 949 (1973). This Court held that Leonhard had no "clear constitutional right to custody or visitation rights," 473 F.2d at 713, and that Kennelly's refusal to disclose the whereabouts of the children was a rational exercise of his discretion, making mandamus inappropriate:

> Kennelly arranged to secrete Rochelle and the children at the specific request of Pascal Calabrese. At that time—February, 1968—Rochelle had legal custody of the children and believed that their safety from threatened violence required that they no longer be visited by their natural father. Information received by Strike Force officials concerning a "murder contract" placed on the heads of the Calabreses confirmed their initial fears. Kennelly's present refusal to disclose the location of Calabrese family is grounded in his sense of obligation to them, both because of his agreement never to disclose their location and of his continued belief that the lives of the children and Rochelle and Pascal would be endangered if this information should become known. In view of the circum-

> stances, we could hardly dismiss this latter fear as groundless or irrational.

Id. at 713-14 (footnote omitted). The Court concluded as follows:

> In sum, the extraordinary factual posture of this case indicates that Kennelly, rather than having abused a discretionary power which he held, acted in good faith in attempting to balance two competing interests: Thomas Leonhard's natural wish to be reunited with his children, and Rochelle Calabrese's equally natural desire to protect the children from serious harm or even death.

Id. at 714 (footnote omitted).

B. *The Present Complaint*

On July 4, 1975, according to plaintiffs' counsel, Rochelle "decided that she had done a grave injustice to her children and to Thomas Leonhard and decided to put the children in contact with their father."[2] On July 11, 1975, Leonhard was reunited with his children. On June 30, 1978, Leonhard filed the present action, asserting twelve separately stated claims, three on his own behalf and nine on behalf of one or all of the children; on these claims each named plaintiff seeks damages ranging from $10,000 to $500,000.[3]

---

2 Transcript of hearing, June 11, 1979. Plaintiffs' brief to this Court on the present appeal also states that Rochelle telephoned Leonhard's attorney on July 4, 1975.

3 Paragraph 1 of the complaint also mentions injunctive relief. However, the complaint nowhere specifies which defendants are sought to be enjoined to do, or forbear from doing, what acts. The final paragraph of the complaint is a general prayer "for judgment declaring unlawful the actions of defendants complained of herein."

The complaint alleges that by separating and concealing the children from Leonhard from 1967 to 1975 and refusing Leonhard's repeated requests to be informed of their whereabouts, Kennelly and other agents of the Organized Crime Strike Force deprived the plaintiffs of their constitutional rights; Kennelly and the agents are said to have had "actual or constructive knowledge" that their acts violated plaintiffs' constitutional rights.[4] The complaint alleges that defendant Giambrone participated in the removal and concealment, that he "knew or should have known" that his conduct was in violation of the plaintiffs' constitutional rights, and that he acted "intentionally and under and by the full authority" of the City of Buffalo. These claims are asserted under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1976) and the First, Fourth, Fifth, Ninth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution.

In addition to these constitutional claims, asserted on behalf of both Leonhard and the children, the complaint asserts several non-constitutional claims on behalf of the children alone. It alleges that Calabrese committed torts against the children, and alleges that the United States, by arranging Calabrese's release and furnishing support and new identities for him, Rochelle and the children, undertook a duty, which it breached, to protect the children from mental and physical harm.[5]

---

4 In addition to these allegations, the complaint contains a section denominated "Parties," in which various government officials including past and present Attorneys General of the United States, United States Marshals and others are described as having formulated procedures and "initiate[d]" the actions complained of.

5 Each child demands damages of $10,000 under the Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1346(a)(2), plus $500,000 under the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1346(b).

In addition to the above defendants, several New York state agencies and officials were made defendants: the New York State Department of Correctional Services and Benjamin Ward, a former Commissioner of that Department, together with all of his predecessors in office; and the New York State Board of Parole and Eugene Hammock as an agent of that Board, together with all of his predecessors in office. None of the complaint's twelve separately stated claims is asserted against the state defendants. These defendants are simply listed in the section of the complaint denominated "Parties," and are alleged to have acted in concert with the federal defendants in releasing Calabrese from a correctional facility in the State of New York in contravention of state law.

C. *The Decisions Below and the Appeals to This Court*

All defendants, except Calabrese (who was never served and made no appearance) and Giambrone, moved to dismiss the complaint on the grounds, *inter alia*, that it failed to state a claim and that all claims asserted were barred by the applicable statutes of limitations. In addition, the federal defendants asserted that the decision in *Leonhard I* barred the plaintiffs from litigating the issues raised in the present complaint under principles of res judicata and collateral estoppel; the state defendants asserted that the state agencies and officials were immune from suit under the Eleventh Amendment; and the City of Buffalo asserted that it was immune from suit under the doctrines of *Monroe v. Pape*, 365 U.S. 167 (1961), and *Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978). In opposition to the motions to dismiss, following a modicum of discovery of the state defendants, plaintiffs

filed a detailed memorandum, several exhibits and two affidavits. The exhibits included copies of administrative claim forms that had been filed by Leonhard and each of the children with the government on June 27, 1977, claiming physical, mental and emotional injury as a result of the removal and concealment of the children. One of the affidavits submitted by plaintiffs was a copy of the affidavit that Kennelly had submitted in *Leonhard I*;[6] the other was an affidavit apparently executed by Rochelle for the purposes of the present action.[7]

Eventually, the claims against all defendants except Calabrese were dismissed. The procession of dismissals and appeals, however, was somewhat unorthodox. On September 21, 1979, Judge Burke ordered the complaint against the federal defendants dismissed on grounds of res judicata, collateral estoppel, statute of limitations, and failure to file timely administrative claims, and ordered the complaint against the City of Buffalo dismissed on the authority of *Monroe v. Pape, supra*. Despite the absence of a certification pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b), judgment for the federal defendants and the City of Buffalo was entered on

---

6 It appears that plaintiffs submitted Kennelly's affidavit for the purpose of comparing the issues here with those decided in *Leonhard I*, rather than for the truth of its statements.

7 We infer that Rochelle is now estranged from Calabrese. Her affidavit, which she executed under the name Rochelle Leonhard, states that she and the children lived with Calabrese from 1968 until June 1975. She states that she now lives in Nevada. The complaint asserts that Calabrese resides in Seattle, Washington.

Rochelle's affidavit recounts, *inter alia*, the moves that she and the children made after their initial removal from New York in 1967, the names they assumed, and the extent to which the government participated in their concealment and support. *See* note 20 *infra*.

September 24.[8] Neither the September 21 order nor the September 24 judgment dealt with the state defendants, Giambrone or Calabrese. On October 17, plaintiffs filed notice of appeal from the September 21 order, and the appeal was docketed in this Court on October 22. On October 25, notwithstanding plaintiffs' October 17 attempt to appeal to this Court, Judge Burke entered a second order, this time dismissing the state defendants on grounds of failure to state a claim under § 1983, immunity under the Eleventh Amendment, and expiration of the statute of limitations. On October 30, plaintiffs filed an amended notice of appeal, seeking review of both of Judge Burke's orders (dated September 21 and October 25). Judgment in favor of the state defendants was entered in the district court on October 30, after plaintiffs' notice of appeal had been filed. Plaintiffs' amended appeal was added to this Court's docket on November 5, at which time there still had been no adjudication of the claims against Giambrone and Calabrese. On November 19, however, Judge Burke sent a letter to the Clerk of the district

---

8 Rule 54(b) provides:

Judgment Upon Multiple Claims or Involving Multiple Parties. When more than one claim for relief is presented in an action, whether as a claim, counterclaim, cross-claim, or third-party claim, or when multiple parties are involved, the court may direct the entry of a final judgment as to one or more but fewer than all of the claims or parties only upon an express determination that there is no just reason for delay and upon an express direction for the entry of judgment. In the absence of such determination and direction, any order or other form of decision, however designated, which adjudicates fewer than all the claims or the rights and liabilities of fewer than all the parties shall not terminate the action as to any of the claims or parties, and the order or other form of decision is subject to revision at any time before the entry of judgment adjudicating all the claims and the rights and liabilities of all the parties.

court, authorizing him to correct a "typographical error" in the September 21 order, by adding Giambrone to the defendants dismissed. The Clerk received this letter on November 20, but since the district court record had already been sent to this Court, no change was actually made on the order itself. No judgment was entered in favor of Giambrone nor did plaintiffs file any additional notice of appeal. Judge Burke's letter of November 19 was eventually entered on the district court docket on February 4, 1980, subsequent to argument cf the appeal in this Court; on February 5, the letter was transmitted to this Court as a supplement to the original record. Finally, on February 15, 1980, Judge Burke ordered that his previous decisions of dismissal "be certified and considered as a final appealable Order."

II. *APPELLATE JURISDICTION*

The federal defendants point out that neither of the judgments appealed from adjudicated the claims against Calabrese and Giambrone. They argue that since the judgments adjudicated the rights of fewer than all the parties and contained no certification pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b), they are not final, and therefore not appealable under 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (1976). For the reasons below we disagree.

A. *Calabrese*

We begin with the effect of the non-dismissal as to Calabrese, who was not served with process and did not appear. It is clear, under Rule 54(b), that when there are two or more defendants who have been served and the district court dismisses the action as to fewer than

all of them, a final judgment may not be entered reflecting that dismissal unless the court so instructs and makes an "express determination" that there is no just reason to delay entry of the judgment. *E.g.*, *New York v. Nuclear Regulatory Comm'n*, 550 F.2d 745, 761 (2d Cir. 1977); *Independent Investor Protective League v. Touche Ross & Co.*, 542 F.2d 156, 157 (2d Cir. 1976); *Robert Stigwood Group Ltd. v. Hurwitz*, 462 F.2d 910, 913 (2d Cir. 1972). In such a situation the early dismissal remains subject to revision until the liabilities of all defendants have been adjudicated; thus an immediate appeal should not be available. When, however, the action is dismissed as to all defendants who have been served and only unserved defendants "remain," the circumstances are materially different. Now there is no reason for Rule 54(b) to preclude the immediate and automatic entry of a final judgment since there is no basis for believing there will be any further adjudications in the action, or, therefore, for holding the dismissals subject to revision.[9] Thus, at least two circuits have held that a defendant who has not been served is not a party for purposes of Rule 54(b). *See United States v. Studivant*, 529 F.2d 673, 674 n.2 (3d Cir. 1976); *Siegmund v. General Commodities Corp.*, 175 F.2d 952, 953 (9th Cir. 1949).

This reading of Rule 54(b) is consistent with the practice which prevailed prior to the adoption of the Rule in its present form (prior to 1963 the Rule dealt with multiple claims but was silent as to multiple

---

9 If the court is given reason to believe that it is premature to assume that service will not be made on absent parties, it can of course direct that judgment reflecting the dismissal of the parties served not be entered until further order of the court. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 58, *quoted in* note 16 *infra*.

parties) and indeed prior to the adoption of the original Federal Rules in 1938. In *Ferguson v. Bartels Brewing Co.*, 284 F.2d 855, 857 (2d Cir. 1960), this Court dismissed an appeal because the order appealed from had not dealt with one of the defendants who had been served, but recognized the distinction in question here:

> [O]ne of the individuals named as codefendant . . . has apparently not been served. Thus he is not a party to the case, and his designation as a codefendant would not bar entry of a final judgment against the other defendants who have been actually made parties.[10]

Compare Hohorst v. Hamburg-American Packet Co., 148 U.S. 262 (1893) (the absence of a dismissal as to some served defendants prevented entry of a final, appealable order of dismissal as to one defendant), *with Hooven, Owens & Rentschler Co. v. John Featherstone's Sons*, 111 F. 81, 84-85 (8th Cir. 1901), *and Bradshaw v. Miners' Bank*, 81 F. 902, 904 (7th Cir. 1897) ("The right to appeal from the decree in favor of the Miners' Bank is not affected by the fact that there has been no decree against the Illinois & Missouri Lead & Zinc Company. That company, though named in the bill as a respondent, was not served with process, and therefore is not a party to the record. . . .").

Hence we conclude that the absence of a dismissal as to Calabrese is no impediment to the present appeal.

---

10 *But see* dictum in *Lyford v. Carter*, 274 F.2d 815, 815 n.1 (2d Cir. 1960), suggesting that a dismissal even as to unserved defendants is a prerequisite to appeal, but construing the dismissal to have applied to all named defendants. The opinion in *Ferguson v. Bartels Brewing Co., supra*, 284 F.2d at 857, points out that the *Lyford* statement "was not necessary to decision." (Footnote omitted.)

B. *Giambrone*

The treatment of Giambrone is somewhat more complex. The federal defendants argue that the appeals taken before Giambrone was dismissed gave this Court no jurisdiction, but that the docketing of those attempted appeals made ineffective the district court's November 19 attempt to amend its September 21 order to reflect the dismissal of Giambrone. In addition they contend that even if the September 21 order were deemed amended by Judge Burke's November 19 letter, no appeal would lie because the dismissal of Giambrone was never embodied in a judgment.[11] We are not persuaded.

As originally entered, the orders of September 21 and October 25 were not appealable because neither of them dealt with the claims against Giambrone. We agree that in those circumstances the attempted appeals did not give us jurisdiction. Judge Burke's letter of November 19, however, authorized the Clerk of the district court to correct a "typographical error" in the order of September 21, to include the dismissal of the complaint as against Giambrone. The question is whether the

---

11 Neither the defendants nor the plaintiffs has voiced any objection to the fact that the claims against Giambrone were dismissed without his ever having moved for such relief. We note, however, that Giambrone's answer pleaded, *inter alia*, statute of limitations, and absence of malice or deceit, and prayed for judgment dismissing the complaint. The district court has the power to dismiss a complaint sua sponte for failure to state a claim, *Robins v. Rarback*, 325 F.2d 929 (2d Cir. 1963), *cert. denied*, 379 U.S. 974 (1965); *see* 5 C. Wright & A. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 1357, at 593 (1969). There appears to be no reason why the same rule should not apply to a dismissal on statute of limitations grounds, at least where, as here, the facts supporting the statute of limitations defense are set forth in the papers plaintiff himself submitted. *See* 10 *id.* § 2719.

district court had retained jurisdiction to make the correction.

Normally the filing of a timely and sufficient notice of appeal immediately transfers jurisdiction, as to any matters involved in the appeal, from the district court to the court of appeals. Once a proper appeal is taken, the district court may generally take action only in aid of the appeal or to correct clerical errors as allowed by the Federal Rules of Civil (or Criminal) Procedure.[12] *See* 9 *Moore's Federal Practice* ¶ 203.11 (2d ed. 1980). Whether or not the filing of a notice of appeal from a *non-appealable* order also immediately divests the district court of jurisdiction to proceed as to the matters involved in the purported appeal is not answered by the Rules themselves, and the courts which have considered the question have divided.[13]

---

12 Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(a) provides as follows:

> *Clerical Mistakes.* Clerical mistakes in judgments, orders or other parts of the record and errors therein arising from oversight or omission may be corrected by the court at any time of its own initiative or on the motion of any party and after such notice, if any, as the court orders. During the pendency of an appeal, such mistakes may be so corrected before the appeal is docketed in the appellate court, and thereafter while the appeal is pending may be so corrected with leave of the appellate court.

If the present appeal had not been docketed in this Court, the district court would have had the power to cause the correction to be made. Or if an appeal had been taken from an appealable order, thus giving us jurisdiction, we could authorize the correction to be made. The question whether the docketing of an attempted appeal from a non-appealable order deprives the district court of jurisdiction to make the clerical correction is part of the broader question whether the filing of a spurious appeal affects the district court's jurisdiction at all.

13 Professor Moore describes the problem as follows:

> The problem was created by the elimination in 1937 of petition and allowance of appeals in favor of the simple filing of the notice. It seems likely that the draftsmen of former Civil Rule

Compare United States v. Hitchmon, 602 F.2d 689 (5th Cir. 1979) (en banc); *Hodgson v. Mahoney*, 460 F.2d 326, 328 (1st Cir.), *cert. denied*, 409 U.S. 1039 (1972); *Ruby v. Secretary of the United States Navy*, 365 F.2d 385, 388-89 (9th Cir. 1966) (en banc), *cert. denied*, 386 U.S. 1011 (1967); *Euziere v. United States*, 266 F.2d 88, 91 (10th Cir. 1959), *vacated on other grounds*, 364 U.S. 282 (1960), holding that the district courts retained jurisdiction, *with Williams v. Bernhardt Bros. Tugboat Serv., Inc.*, 357 F.2d 883 (7th Cir. 1966); *District 65, Distributive, Processing & Office Workers Union v. McKague*, 216 F.2d 153 (3d Cir. 1954), holding to the contrary. District courts in this circuit have taken the position that such an attempted appeal does not deprive them of the power to proceed, *Browning Debenture Holders' Committee v. DASA Corp.*, 454 F. Supp. 88 (S.D.N.Y. 1978); *Weisman v. Darneille*, 79 F.R.D. 389 (S.D.N.Y. 1978); *Lowenschuss v. Kane*, 392 F. Supp. 59 (S.D.N.Y. 1974),[14] and we find

---

73(a) had in mind the simplification of appellate procedure by the elimination of a step that was looked upon as pro forma. Former Civil Rule 73(a) and present Rule 3(a) provide the procedure for "an appeal permitted by law." Such an appeal may be "taken" by filing a notice of appeal. An appeal not permitted by law may not be "taken" at all, and the court of appeals requires no jurisdiction of it. If the court of appeals acquires no jurisdiction, it seems to follow that the district court loses no *jurisdiction* that it otherwise would have. Of course the court of appeals has jurisdiction to determine its jurisdiction, and the district court cannot interfere with that. To hold, however, that the mere invocation of the jurisdiction of the court of appeals when it is obvious that it has none, will stay all proceedings in the district court, appears to be a most inefficient way to manage the case.

9 *Moore's Federal Practice* ¶ 203.11, at 3-51 to 3-52 (1980) (footnotes omitted; emphasis in original).

14 *But see Gumer v. Shearson, Hammill & Co.*, 516 F.2d 283, 285 (2d Cir. 1974), stating that "[t]echnically, we could dismiss the appeal on

this to be the preferable view. While greater certainty as to district court power results from the more rigid rule that any filing of a notice of appeal divests the district court of jurisdiction as to the matters covered by the notice, we see no efficiency to be gained by allowing a party arbitrarily to halt the district court proceedings by filing a plainly unauthorized notice which confers on this Court the power to do nothing but dismiss the appeal. Hence we conclude that the district court retained power to correct the judgment of September 24 to reflect its dismissal of the action against Giambrone.

A related question is whether we are deprived of jurisdiction to hear the appeal from the now final order below on the ground that the notice of appeal was premature. Some courts have taken a strict view that the court of appeals must have jurisdiction of the appeal, if at all, at the time the notice is filed. *See, e.g., Williams v. Bernhardt Bros. Tugboat Serv., Inc., supra.* Others have deemed premature appeals to be validated by subsequent events. *See, e.g., Lemke v. United States*, 346 U.S. 325 (1953); *Richerson v. Jones*, 551 F.2d 918, 922 (3d Cir. 1977); *Tilden Financial Corp. v. Palo Tire Serv. Inc.*, 596 F.2d 604, 606-07 (3d Cir. 1979); *Plummer v. United States*, 580 F.2d 72 (3d Cir. 1978); *Morris v. Uhl & Lopez Eng'rs, Inc.*, 442 F.2d 1247, 1250-51 (10th Cir. 1971); *Markham v. Holt*, 369 F.2d 940 (5th Cir. 1966); *Ruby v. Secretary of the United States Navy*, 365 F.2d 385 (9th Cir. 1966) (en banc), *cert. denied*, 386 U.S. 1011 (1967). *See also* 9

---

the ground that the district court had no jurisdiction to enter the Rule 54(b) certificate after the appeal had been taken" from a non-final order, but declining to do so.

Moore's Federal Practice ¶ 204.14 (2d ed. 1980); 15 C. Wright, A. Miller, & E. Cooper, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 3915 at 599-600 (1976).[15] In the absence of prejudice to the nonappealing party, this Court too has declined to dismiss premature notices of appeal where subsequent actions of the district court have imbued the order appealed from with finality. *See, e.g., Sanchez v. Maher*, 560 F.2d 1105, 1107 n.2 (2d Cir. 1977) (appeal allowed where notice of appeal filed after the decision but before entry of judgment; judgment not entered until after argument of the appeal); *Gumer v. Shearson, Hammill & Co.*, 516 F.2d 283 (2d Cir. 1974) (appeal allowed where, after notice of appeal had been filed, district court entered Rule 54(b) certification *nunc pro tunc); Kaufman & Ruderman, Inc. v. Cohn & Rosenberger*, 177 F.2d 849 (2d Cir. 1949) (appeal decided on merits, with permission granted to seek Rule 54(b) certification, *nunc pro tunc).* The defendants in the present case have not indicated any respect in which they would be better off if the appeal had been taken after the November 19 correction, rather than before. We therefore treat the premature notice of appeal as having been timely filed after the dismissals by the district court became final orders.

Finally, we do not find the absence of an actual judgment embodying the dismissal of Giambrone fatal to our jurisdiction. Although Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 requires that a judgment be set forth on a separate document,[16]

---

15 *See also* Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(2), which, as amended effective August 1, 1979, provides that except in circumstances not applicable here, "a notice of appeal filed after the announcement of a decision or order but before the entry of the judgment or order shall be treated as filed after such entry and on the day thereof."

16 Rule 58 provides:

(footnote continued on next page)

this requirement is intended merely to pinpoint, principally for the benefit of the appellant, the commencement of time for filing a notice of appeal. Thus, in *Bankers Trust Co. v. Mallis*, 435 U.S. 381 (1978), the Supreme Court held that appellate jurisdiction could properly be assumed even though the separate document requirement had not been met:

> Certainty as to timeliness, however, is not advanced by holding that appellate jurisdiction does not exist absent a separate judgment. If, by error, a separate judgment is not filed before a party appeals, nothing but delay would flow from requiring the court of appeals to dismiss the appeal. Upon dismissal, the district court would simply file and enter the separate judgment, from which a timely appeal would then be taken. Wheels would spin for no practical purpose.

Id. at 385 (footnote omitted). The Court in *Bankers Trust* noted that the district court had clearly intended that its opinion and order be the final decision in the

---

Subject to the provisions of Rule 54(b): (1) upon a general verdict of a jury, or upon a decision by the court that a party shall recover only a sum certain or costs or that all relief shall be denied, the clerk, unless the court otherwise orders, shall forthwith prepare, sign, and enter the judgment without awaiting any direction by the court; (2) upon a decision by the court granting other relief, or upon a special verdict or a general verdict accompanied by answers to interrogatories, the court shall promptly approve the form of the judgment, and the clerk shall thereupon enter it. Every judgment shall be set forth on a separate document. A judgment is effective only when so set forth and when entered as provided in Rule 79(a). Entry of the judgment shall not be delayed for taxing of costs. Attorneys shall not submit forms of judgment except upon direction of the court, and these directions shall not be given as a matter of course.

case, "[a] judgment of dismissal" was recorded in the district clerk's docket, and the appellee did not object to the taking of the appeal in the absence of a separate judgment. In those circumstances, the Court held, the parties "should be deemed to have waived" the separate document requirement and a court of appeals can properly take jurisdiction. *Id.* at 387-88. *See Elfenbein v. Gulf & Western Industries, Inc.*, 590 F.2d 445, 449 (2d Cir. 1978); *Turner v. Air Transport Lodge 1894*, 585 F.2d 1180 (2d Cir. 1978).

While the facts of the present case are somewhat different, the rationale of *Bankers Trust* requires that we not spin our wheels here by dismissing for lack of a judgment. Judge Burke clearly intended the September 21 order, as corrected by the November 19 letter, and as supplemented by the October 25 order, to be his final decision in the case, and separate judgments were actually entered prior to his correction of the "typographical" omission of Giambrone from the September order. All that remained was the ministerial task of making the mandated correction of the September judgment already entered, instruction for which has itself now been entered in the docket.

We do not believe the interests of any party will be harmed by our refusal to dismiss at this stage. Giambrone has not objected to the taking of this appeal in the absence of a judgment in his favor. It is true that the federal defendants have objected, but they have not shown any respect in which they have been prejudiced; since final dismissals have been ordered as to all served defendants, it is difficult to see how the temporary technical defect as to Giambrone could prejudice any defendant. We therefore will instruct the Clerk of the district court to make the appropriate correction upon

receipt of our mandate, and for present purposes we treat such correction as having been made. We now turn to the merits of the appeal.

III. *LEONHARD'S CLAIMS*

We deal first with the claims on behalf of Leonhard, which assert that each group of defendants violated Leonhard's constitutional rights. Among the defenses interposed was the bar of the statute of limitations. For the reasons below we agree that Leonhard's claims are time-barred.[17]

A. *The Federal Defendants*

The gist of Leonhard's claims against the federal defendants is that, commencing on or about August 15, 1967, various federal officials violated his constitutional rights by removing and concealing his children from him until July 1975. Leonhard's claims are apparently based directly on the United States Constitution, under the principles of *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). Since this action was not commenced until June 30, 1978, more than ten years after the removal of the children, the defendants contend that it is time-barred. The merit of their contention depends on when Leonhard's causes of action accrued and what period of limitations is applied.

Leonhard contends that the statute did not begin to run until July 1975. He argues that his claim accrued

---

17 We do not, therefore, reach the other grounds relied on by the district court for dismissal of Leonhard's claims.

anew each time he wished to visit his children and was unable to do so: "Each time he was deprived of these rights, a new cause of action accrued and continued to accrue until July 11, 1975, when Appellant and his children were reunited." (Brief at 57). There are a variety of possible dates on which Leonhard's claim may be deemed to have ripened for statute of limitations purposes, but none of them as late as that he urges.

Under general principles of law, a cause of action accrues when conduct that invades the rights of another has caused injury. When the injury occurs, the injured party has the right to bring suit for all of the damages, past, present and future, caused by the defendant's acts. *See Restatement (Second) of Torts* §§ 899, 910 (1977). The earliest allegedly wrongful act which resulted in Leonhard's loss of his children occurred sometime in 1967, when Leonhard's children were removed from New York and first concealed from him.[18]

At common law this general principle is subject to the modifications that a claim to redress a continuing wrong will be deemed to have accrued on the date of the last wrongful act. Thus, in New York, "[d]espite the

---

18 There is some disagreement as to just when in 1967 Rochelle and the children were in fact removed from New York: Leonhard places the date at about August 15, the date on which he first attempted to visit the children and was unable to find them; Kennelly's affidavit states that the first move took place in June; and Rochelle's affidavit states that they were first moved in February. Whether the actual date of removal was the date that Leonhard first discovered his loss or was one of the earlier dates is immaterial in the present circumstances. This would be so even if, contrary to our conclusion, the cause of action were deemed not to have accrued until discovery by Leonhard that his children were gone, *see Birnbaum v. United States*, 588 F.2d 319, 335 n.31 (2d Cir. 1978), rather than upon their removal. *See* note 19 *infra*.

general principle that a cause of action accrues when the wrong is done, regardless of when it is discovered, certain wrongs are considered to be continuing wrongs, and the statute of limitations, therefore, runs from the commission of the last wrongful act." N.Y. Civ. Prac. Law [hereinafter "CPLR"] § 203 note (McKinney 1972) (McLaughlin, Practice Commentaries C203:1). *See also Restatement (Second) of Torts* § 899, comment *c* ("For false imprisonment, the statute begins to run only when the imprisonment ends, since the period of imprisonment is treated as a unit.") This rule is well illustrated by the decision in *Montgomery v. Crum*, 199 Ind. 660, 161 N.E. 251, 257-59 (1928). There a mother, who had been awarded custody of her daughter following a divorce, sought damages for the abduction of the daughter by her estranged husband and his parents, which had resulted in a nine-year separation of mother from daughter. In response to an assertion that the two-year statute of limitations barred the mother's claim, the court observed that if the abduction consisted of an unbroken chain of wrongful acts at least some of which occurred during the two years immediately preceding suit, the statute would not bar the action, stating that "the statute of limitations will not begin to run until there is a cessation of the overt acts constituting the wrong." 161 N.E. at 259. But if all of the overt acts preceded that two-year period, the statute would have run. *Id. Accord: Restatement (Second) of Torts* § 899, comment *c*: "When there has been a loss of services over a considerable period of time by a *continuous series of acts*, as when a child is withheld from the custody of his parents, the injured party recovers only for that to which he was entitled within the statutory period before suit." (Emphasis

added.) Thus if we are to apply the common law modification to determine when Leonhard's causes of action arose, we will have to determine the date of the defendants' last overt act. A preliminary question is whether common law rules should be applied.

Although we must look to state law to determine what period of limitations applies, *see* page 22 *infra*, the issue as to when Leonhard's cause of action accrued remains a question of federal law, *Kaiser v. Cahn*, 510 F.2d 282, 285 (2d Cir. 1974), and there are persuasive reasons in the present case for eschewing application of the common law accrual principles appropriate for torts such as abduction. First, the defendants at all times dealt with the children's mother, who had custody of them and who joined in and consented to their relocation and concealment. A claim for abduction or false imprisonment would thus be untenable. *See* part V. C. *infra*. Moreover, there were reasons for the defendants' actions which strongly implicate federal interests. Their actions were concededly part of "their efforts to deal with a very serious problem, organized crime, and to make an agreement, a deal, with a government informant." (Statement of plaintiffs' counsel at hearing in district court.) The procurement of testimony against alleged members of organized crime will normally require appropriate protection of both the informant and his family. Relocation and concealment will commonly be part of this protection. To prevent intimidation, we would think the protection would begin prior to any disclosure to the putative criminals that the informant will testify. Thereafter the protection would continue in order to prevent reprisals: after the government has obtained the testimony of the informant, it would hardly seem prudent or conscion-

able for the government officials to turn and disclose the whereabouts of the informant's family. It appears, therefore, that once the family of an informant is concealed, the federal officials are virtually committed to continue that concealment for some period of time. Thus, it is the initial concealment which would give rise to a right of action, and subsequent acts in furtherance and continuation of the concealment should not give rise to new or renewed causes of action. If we apply this principle, Leonhard's cause of action accrued in 1967.

Even if common law accrual rules applied, however, Leonhard would not be able to justify his preferred 1975 date, since he does not allege that any of the defendants' acts occurred as late as 1975.[19] While the

---

19 Leonhard also argues that the statute did not commence to run until 1975 because of fraudulent concealment. Apparently he argues that he was told by defendants that his children were being properly cared for and did not learn until 1975 that they were being mistreated. He also appears to claim, although it is far from clear, that the defendants told him that the children were in danger, when in fact they were not in danger. For the latter proposition he refers to Rochelle's affidavit which states, in part, that

> according to all reports received by affiant from agents of the City of Buffalo and agents of the Justice Department of the United States, neither she nor her children were in any danger from persons involved in organized crime as a result of testimony of PASCAL CALABRESE on behalf of the United States.

It is difficult to know what to make of this statement. It does not indicate that Rochelle was unconcerned for the children's safety; it does not contradict Kennelly's affidavit submitted in *Leonhard I* detailing Rochelle's insistence that their whereabouts not be disclosed. And the affidavit in no way suggests that at the time Rochelle agreed to the relocation of herself and the children, any defendant falsely represented to her that she or the children were in danger. What seems clear, however, is that neither Rochelle's affidavit nor any other facts presented by plaintiffs supports resort to the doctrine of fraudulent concealment. This federally created doctrine in some circumstances allows an effective tolling of the statute of limitations if the existence of a cause of action has been fraudulently concealed from the holder of the claim. *See United States v. Diamond Coal & Coke Co.*, 255 U.S. 323 (1921);

complaint alleges conclusorily that the federal defendants concealed the children until 1975 and refused his "repeated requests to be informed of [their] whereabouts," no overt acts are alleged. And the affidavit of Rochelle, submitted to the district court by plaintiffs, shows only that the government concealed and supported Rochelle and the children until July 1970.[20]

Exploration Co. v. United States, 247 U.S. 435 (1918); *Bailey v. Glover*, 88 U.S. (21 Wall.) 342 (1875). *See generally Moviecolor Ltd. v. Eastman Kodak Co.*, 288 F.2d 80 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 368 U.S. 821 (1961). Leonhard's cause of action was for the termination of his relationship with his children. (Not being their custodian, he had no right to recover for injuries they may have suffered. *See Restatement (Second) of Torts* § 703, comment *e*.) There is no question here that Leonhard learned of the removal and concealment of the children as early as August 1967. He brought suit to compel disclosure of their whereabouts in July 1971 (*see* note 26). Any claim that his cause of action was concealed from him until 1975 is specious.

20 Paragraphs 6-9 of Rochelle's affidavit state as follows:

SIXTH: That at certain times relevant to this action PASCAL CALABRESE was a paid informant and agent for, and was under the control of the Justice Department of the United States.

SEVENTH: That your affiant and her children resided with PASCAL CALABRESE after being removed from Buffalo, New York, by agents of the United States Department of Justice and the City of Buffalo. They were relocated with the assistance of the United States Government and lived in Loring Air Force Base, Caribu, Maine under the assumed name of CAPT. PATRICK ANDREWS from February 1967 to March 1968; and resided in Bel Aire, Maryland, under the assumed name of ANGELO from June 1968 to August 1968; and, resided in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and its surrounding areas under the assumed name of ANGELO from August 1968 to July 1970.

EIGHTH: That throughout this period the federal government provided monetary, financial and employment assistance to PASCAL CALABRESE.

NINTH: That from July 1970 to the present, MICHAEL, KAREN, and STEPHEN LEONHARD have resided in Reno, Nevada, with affiant, using the assumed name of CALA until about July 1975.

Thus, even applying common law rules, on the basis of the evidence presented by plaintiffs we conclude that Leonhard's claims accrued not later than July 1970.[21]

The remaining question is within what period Leonhard was required to bring suit. Since Congress has not provided a statute of limitations for *Bivens* actions, we must use the most nearly analogous state statute of limitations. *See Board of Regents v. Tomanio*, 48 U.S.L.W. 4556 (U.S. May 19, 1980); *Johnson v. Railway Express Agency, Inc.*, 421 U.S. 454 (1975).

In *Regan v. Sullivan*, 557 F.2d 300 (2d Cir. 1977), this Court held that the most appropriate statute for a *Bivens* action accruing in New York is either the three-year limitation provided by CPLR § 214(2) for an action to recover upon a liability imposed by statute, or the six-year limitation provided by CPLR § 213(1) for actions for which no limitation is specifically prescribed. In *Regan* we had no need to determine which of the two periods was the more appropriate because the action was barred under either statute. The same is true here. Since Leonhard's causes of action accrued no later than 1970, *i.e.*, more than six years before the June 1978 commencement of this suit, the suit is barred.

B. *The State Defendants*

Leonhard's complaint challenges only a single act by the state defendants: that they released Pascal Calabrese from custody prior to the date authorized by law. While the complaint is far from clear in this respect, it

---

21 An intermediate possibility would be February 1968, when Rochelle and the children were relocated by the government following Calabrese's release from prison.

may be construed to allege that the release of Calabrese in 1968 violated Leonhard's constitutional rights and to seek relief under § 1983.[22]

As to § 1983 actions, like *Bivens*-type actions, Congress has not specified a statute of limitations, and again we must look to state law. With respect to § 1983 actions brought in federal district courts in New York, this Court has repeatedly held that the appropriate period is the three-year limitation of CPLR § 214(2). *Taylor v. Mayone*, No. 79-2078 (2d Cir. June 27, 1980); *Quinn v. Syracuse Model Neighborhood Corp.*, 613 F.2d 438, 449 (2d Cir. 1980);[23] *Leigh v. McGuire*, 613 F.2d 380 (2d Cir. 1979), *vacated and remanded for further consideration*, 48 U.S.L.W. 3767 (U.S. May 27, 1980); *Meyer v. Frank*, 550 F.2d 726 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 434 U.S. 830 (1977); *Kaiser v. Cahn*, 510 F.2d 282 (2d Cir. 1974); *Ortiz v. LaVallee*, 442 F.2d 912 (2d Cir. 1971); *Swan v. Board of Higher Education*, 319 F.2d 56 (2d Cir. 1963); *Bomar v. Keyes*, 162 F.2d 136, 140 (2d

---

22 42 U.S.C. § 1983 provides as follows:

> Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress.

23 *But see* footnote 6 of the *Quinn* opinion, noting that recent developments suggest the applicability of New York's six-year statute for actions not otherwise provided for, on the ground that § 1983 itself does not impose liabilities but merely provides additional remedies. *See Chapman v. Houston Welfare Rights Org.*, 441 U.S. 600 (1979); *State v. Cortelle Corp.*, 38 N.Y.2d 83, 85, 378 N.Y.S.2d 654, 655 (1975). We need not explore this possibility here since either the three-year or the six-year period would bar Leonhard's claim. *See also Board of Regents v. Tomanio, supra*, 48 U.S.L.W. at 4558 n.4.

Cir.) (L. Hand, J.) (predecessor statute of § 214(2)), *cert. denied*, 332 U.S. 825 (1947).

There is no reason to apply a different limitations period here. Since Calabrese was paroled in 1968, and Leonhard's complaint was filed in 1978, Leonhard's action against the state defendants is time-barred.

C. *The City Defendants*

Leonhard's claim against the city defendants also is asserted under § 1983. The claim is that Giambrone, acting under color of law as an employee of the Buffalo police department and acting with the authority of the City, participated in the removal and concealment of Leonhard's children from him.[24] Although the complaint contains conclusory assertions that Giambrone and the City refused to reveal the children's whereabouts to Leonhard and impeded Leonhard's efforts to find them, it does not allege any overt acts on the part

---

24 This claim and the children's claim against Giambrone assert that throughout the period from 1967 to 1975, Leonhard was the legal guardian and custodian of the children. These allegations are contradicted by plaintiffs' brief on appeal and by records of which we may take judicial notice. Plaintiffs' brief on this appeal indicates that it was not until June 1971 that Leonhard obtained a court order stating that he had custody of the children. This is substantiated by Leonhard's amended petition for mandamus in *Leonhard I*, which also stated that the 1966 divorce decree had given Rochelle custody with Leonhard having merely visitation rights. A certified copy of the divorce decree is part of the record in *Leonhard I* and is quoted in note 1, *supra*.

Finally, there is substantial question whether the New York Supreme Court order obtained by Leonhard in June 1971 was effective to give him custody of the children. The order was obtained by default, and according to Rochelle's affidavit she and the children resided in Nevada at that time. In the absence of both Rochelle and the children from the state it does not appear that the New York court had jurisdiction to affect the custody of the children. *See May v. Anderson*, 345 U.S. 528 (1953); *Restatement (Second) of Conflicts of Laws* § 79 (1969).

of Giambrone or the City after 1967. We conclude, therefore, that Leonhard's claims against Giambrone and the City accrued in 1967 when the children were removed, or in any event no later than 1970 when the last overt acts to conceal the children occurred. *See* part A above. Since a three-year period of limitations applies to these claims, *see* part B above, Leonhard's claims against the city defendants were properly dismissed.

IV. *THE CHILDREN'S CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIMS*

As outlined in part I, the children, like Leonhard, assert that the acts of the defendants violated their constitutional rights. The district court drew no distinction between the claims of Leonhard and those of the children. The children's constitutional claims against each group of defendants were held barred by the statute of limitations; in addition their claims against the federal defendants were held barred by principles of collateral estoppel, their claims against the state defendants were held barred by the Eleventh Amendment and dismissed for failure to state a claim, and their claims against the city defendants were held barred by the principle of *Monroe v. Pape, supra*. We disagree with certain of these rationales, although not with the results.

While the claims of Leonhard himself are barred by the applicable statutes of limitations, the constitutional claims of the children are not. As noted above, for both *Bivens*-type actions and § 1983 actions we must borrow the most appropriate state statutes of limitations. In addition, however, to the extent not inconsistent with the policies underlying the federal claims, we must borrow any restrictions placed by the state on the

running of the statutes. *See Board of Regents v. Tomanio, supra*; *Johnson v. Railway Express, supra*. New York CPLR § 208 provides that the running of the statute of limitations is tolled if the person possessing the cause of action is under a disability because of infancy. A three-year or longer statute of limitations is tolled until three years after the disability ends. Since the record indicates that the oldest of the Leonhard children did not reach the age of 18 until six months before this suit was commenced,[25] we conclude that the assertion of their claims is timely.

Nor should the children's claims have been dismissed on grounds of collateral estoppel. The district court felt that the denial of mandamus in *Leonhard I* presupposed a finding that the defendants owed no duty to the children. While there may be ground for differing views as to whether the claims of Leonhard himself are barred by the decision in *Leonhard I*,[26] there is no

---

25 As to the children's ages we rely on Rochelle's affidavit. There is about a one-year discrepancy between Rochelle's affidavit and the administrative claim forms as to each of the children's ages. The difference is of no legal consequence here.

26 There appears to be some force to the argument that Leonhard has asserted in both actions the same claims of wrongdoing by the defendants, the same invasions of his rights, and the same legal basis for his claims, and that only the relief prayed for is different. Thus, although Leonhard contends that he never raised in *Leonhard I* the issues raised here, "namely, separation, removal and concealment," (*e.g.*, Brief at 23), his amended petition for mandamus in *Leonhard I* alleged *inter alia* that the defendants caused the children to be "secreted in a location unknown to" him (¶ 3F), and "have consistently refused to divulge" their whereabouts (¶ 5), that the defendants were "responsible for this deprivation of custody and for the separation of [Leonhard] from his children" (¶ 3L), and that by reason of defendants' acts Leonhard "was deprived of his liberty to see and communicate with his children and now is effectively deprived of custody of his children in violation of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution's requirement of due process." (¶ 4B.)

(footnote continued on next page)

question that the claims of the children are not so barred. The children were not parties to *Leonhard I*, and the duties in issue there were those allegedly owed to Leonhard and not to the children. "Some litigants—those who never appeared in a prior action—may not be collaterally estopped without litigating the issue. They have never had a chance to present their evidence and arguments on the claim. Due process prohibits estopping them despite one or more existing adjudications of the identical issue which stand squarely against their position." *Blonder-Tongue Laboratories, Inc. v. University of Ill. Foundation*, 402 U.S. 313, 329 (1971); *see Parklane Hosiery Co. v. Shore*, 439 U.S. 322, 329 (1979).

This leaves for analysis the contentions that the children have failed to state a constitutional claim upon which relief can be granted. We consider this contention with respect to each group of defendants in turn.

Nevertheless, the relief sought in *Leonhard I*, mandamus to compel disclosure, was different from the present claim for damages. While there appears to have been no reason that Leonhard could not have sued for damages at the same time that he sought mandamus, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 18; *Crawford v. Cushman*, 531 F.2d 1114, 1126 (2d Cir. 1976); *Restatement (Second) of Judgments* §§ 61, 61.1 (Tent. Dr. No. 5, 1978), the nature of the relief sought by the mandamus petition called into question a duty different from that which is fundamental to the present case. In *Leonhard I* the issue was simply whether the defendants could be ordered, at that time, to disclose the children's whereabouts, and the principal question was whether the decision not to disclose was within the defendants' discretion. Given our view that the subsequent concealment of the children follows virtually automatically upon the initial undertaking to protect them, *see* part III. A. *supra*, it would seem harsh to hold that an unsuccessful suit to terminate the subsequent concealment barred pursuit of the more appropriate claim to redress their wrongful removal.

APPENDIX A

Opinion of United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit

A. *The Federal Defendants*

The complaint alleges that the acts of Kennelly and other agents of the Department of Justice in removing the children in 1967 and concealing them from Leonhard deprived the children of their constitutional rights to visitation, companionship and rearing by their natural father, without due process of law.[27] Our analysis of the interests and status of the children and of the governmental functions involved persuades us that the children have failed to state a constitutional claim.

It has long been recognized that the relationship between parent and child is constitutionally protected. *E.g., Quilloin v. Wolcott*, 434 U.S. 246, 255 (1978); *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205, 231-33 (1972); *Stanley v. Illinois*, 405 U.S. 645 (1972); *Meyer v. Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390, 399-401 (1923); *cf. Prince v. Massachusetts*, 321 U.S. 158 (1944). The Due Process Clause limits the power of the state to take action which ruptures or impinges upon the parent-child

---

27 It is not clear to what extent plaintiffs seek to assert these claims against government agencies as well as individuals. We note that all of the claims against the federal agencies were properly dimissed, because Congress has not waived their sovereign immunity. *See Kessler v. General Servs. Adm.*, 341 F.2d 275 (2d Cir. 1964); *Gnotta v. United States*, 415 F.2d 1271, 1277 (8th Cir. 1969) (Blackmun, J.), *cert. denied*, 397 U.S. 934 (1970). It is immaterial that the defense of sovereign immunity was not expressly raised by the agencies below nor pressed by them on this appeal. Since sovereign immunity is a jurisdictional defect, *see United States v. Sherwood*, 312 U.S. 584, 587-88 (1941), it can be raised at any time, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3), and indeed by a court of appeals on its own motion. *Hill v. United States*, 571 F.2d 1098, 1100 (9th Cir. 1978); *Armstrong v. United States*, 283 F.2d 122, 123 (3d Cir. 1960). *Cf. Alabama v. Pugh*, 438 U.S. 781, 782 n.1 (1978); *Edelman v. Jordan*, 415 U.S. 651, 678 (1974).

relationship. As the Supreme Court stated in *Quilloin v. Wolcott, supra*:

> We have little doubt that the Due Process Clause would be offended "[i]f a State were to attempt to force the breakup of a natural family, over the objections of the parents and their children, without some showing of unfitness and for the sole reason that to do so was thought to be in the children's best interest."

434 U.S. at 255 (quoting *Smith v. Organization of Foster Families*, 431 U.S. 816, 862-63 (1977) (Stewart, J., concurring in judgment)). *Cf. Moore v. City of East Cleveland*, 431 U.S. 494, 503-06 (1977) (plurality opinion) (state may not arbitrarily prevent members of an extended family from living together). Thus, the state may not constitutionally withhold children, properly taken into temporary custody by the state in an emergency, from their mother without her consent and without judicial authorization. *Duchesne v. Sugarman*, 566 F.2d 817, 828 (2d Cir. 1977); *see Morrison v. Jones*, 607 F.2d 1269, 1276 (9th Cir. 1979), *cert. denied*, 100 S. Ct. 1648 (1980). Nor may it deprive a divorced father of notice and an opportunity to be heard before his child is adopted by his marital successor. *Armstrong v. Manzo*, 380 U.S. 545 (1964). Even in cases of child neglect, the Due Process Clause places limits on the state's power to terminate the parent-child relationship. *See generally* Note, *Constitutional Limitations on the Scope of State Child Neglect Statutes*, 79 Colum. L. Rev. 719 (1979).

In analyzing the applicability of such precepts to the children's claims in the present case it is important at the outset to identify certain contentions that are not

pertinent here. First, the visitation rights of Leonhard are not involved. Even assuming that Leonhard had a constitutionally protected interest in visiting his children, a question we have not reached because Leonhard's claims are time-barred, the children do not have standing to complain of abridgement of Leonhard's rights. Second, the theory that the removal and concealment of the children "consigned" them to the company of a convicted criminal has no factual basis. The children were committed to Calabrese's company when Rochelle married him, and they lived with him before he commenced to serve his prison term. Rochelle had custody of them when she separated from Leonhard, and her custody was not altered when she married Calabrese. While the early release of Calabrese accelerated the return of the children to the company of Calabrese, plaintiffs cite no authority, and, we know of none, to suggest that this violated any right guaranteed them by the Constitution. Finally, we are not dealing with a governmental rupture of a family unit. The family unit that once was comprised of Leonhard, Rochelle and their children, had already been ruptured by Leonhard and Rochelle. Upon their divorce, Leonhard was deprived of custodial rights and was awarded only visitation rights. All of this occurred well in advance of the involvement of the federal defendants in the lives of the children.

The crux of the children's claim is simply that they were placed beyond the reach of their father. The fact that this occurred without a hearing did not implicate the children's constitutional rights because it was done in the course of the defendants' official duties, was done for the protection of the children, and was done with Rochelle's consent.

The most critical fact in determining whether the rights of the children were violated is the fact that Rochelle had sole custody of them. She was the parent who had been entrusted with their care, their education, their health and safety. There is no question that Rochelle consented to the removal and concealment of the children, nor that they remained in her custody for the entire time that they were concealed from their father. It is to be presumed that she was properly concerned for their welfare. *See Parham v. J.R.*, 442 U.S. 584, 602-03 (1979). There is no indication in her affidavit, nor any suggestion by the plaintiffs, that this was not so. And surely the presumption is reinforced by the circumstances, which were instinct with the risk of harm to the children the minute Calabrese became a potential witness against organized crime figures; the risk would increase substantially when the fact that Calabrese might testify became known to the accused criminals, as the children could become targets of premonitory or retaliatory acts, or could be the incidental victims of acts directly against Calabrese. It was Rochelle's right and her duty to weigh the interest of the children in being available for periodic visits from their father against their exposure to possible kidnapping or bodily harm. Her decision appears to be unassailable.

It is also important to note that the officials involved were attempting to carry out two official functions: first, to stamp out organized crime, and second, to protect witnesses, and the families of witnesses, who would testify or had testified against members of organized crime. There is no question that the officials' decision to remove and conceal Rochelle and the children was made in pursuit of these functions. The

plaintiffs' attorney described the decision as part of "their efforts to deal with a very serious problem, organized crime, and to make an agreement, a deal, with a government informant." In deciding to protect the family of such an informant the officials must be entitled to rely on the consents of the family members to be removed and concealed. The Leonhard children, of course, were not old enough to make such decisions for themselves; their ages ranged from three to seven. Had they been old enough to make their own decisions, the officials could have relied on their consents and the children would obviously have no claim against those officials. Given their actual infancy, their mother made the decision. The fact that the decision was made by only one parent rather than both[28] is of no legal consequence since custody resided solely with the consenting parent. *See Parham v. J.R., supra*, 442 U.S. at 589 and *passim; Boone v. Wyman*, 295 F. Supp. 1143 (S.D.N.Y.) (Mansfield, J.), *aff'd*, 412 F.2d 857 (2d Cir. 1969), *cert. denied*, 396 U.S. 1024 (1970). *See also Duchesne v. Sugarman, supra*. Thus we conclude that the federal officials' removal and concealment of the children on the consent of their mother and sole custodian, did not violate the children's constitutional rights; given the fact of Rochelle's consent, no hearing as to the rights of the children was required.

Indeed, considering the uncivilized nature of the risks against which the removal and concealment of the children sought to forfend, it is difficult to envision the possibility of a hearing, either before or after the fact, which would be "useful [ ] . . . in the given

---

28 Certainly if both Rochelle and Leonhard had consented the children would have no claim.

circumstances," and which would not entail "adverse consequences." *See* Friendly, *"Some Kind of Hearing"*, 123 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1267, 1278 (1975). If a hearing had been held prior to the removal and concealment of the children, and Calabrese either remained willing to testify or the alleged criminals believed, even erroneously, that there remained any possibility that he would testify, the children would be exposed to the danger of abduction or other harm as leverage against Calabrese to prevent his testimony. A hearing after Calabrese testified could hardly be more meaningful since it would expose the children to the danger of retaliatory acts, undoubtedly designed in part to discourage other potential witnesses against organized crime. And, as we have discussed at pages 20-21 above, for the government officials to reveal the whereabouts of the children after testimony has been given and before the officials feel the dangers have abated would be the very essence of bad faith. We are thus compelled to conclude that due process did not require a hearing on the decision by Rochelle and the government officials to remove and conceal the children.

This conclusion finds support in the recent decision of the Supreme Court in *Parham v. J.R.*, *supra*. Involved there was the question whether the state could constitutionally rely on a decision by a child's parent or guardian to commit the child to a mental institution without a hearing before or after the commitment. The Court held that despite the child's substantial liberty interest in not being confined, he has no constitutional claim when his parent or guardian has decided that he should be placed in a mental hospital and the hospital psychiatrists have determined that he needs treatment. *Id.* at 606-13. The liberty interest in *Parham* was clearly more substantial than the interest of the

children here in the possibility of periodic visits from their father. And the effect of the parents' decision in *Parham*, *i.e.*, the complete removal of the child from any family environment, was far more drastic than the effect here of the children's relocation accompanied by their mother. Since, as was held in *Parham*, a child has no right to a hearing when his parent decides to obtain needed medical treatment for him by transferring him from the family to the confinement of a mental institution, *a fortiori* children have no cause to complain when their custodial parent and the government officials charged with such functions decide to protect their safety by relocating and concealing them, with their parent.[29] If the more drastic intrusion does not require a hearing, surely the less drastic intrusion does not.

In sum, since "[w]hat process is constitutionally due cannot be divorced from the nature of the ultimate decision that is being made," *id.* at 608, we conclude that the officials' exercise of their discretion and their reliance on Rochelle's consent to the removal and concealment of the children to protect them from organized crime, did not deny the children due process of law.[30] The children's constitutional claims were properly dismissed.

---

29 It could be argued that *Parham* can be distinguished because the need for medical treatment was determined by psychiatrist factfinders who were neutral, whereas here the federal officials who decided to remove and conceal the children were "interested" in their protection, in the sense that only by protecting them could they obtain the testimony they desired. We do not view this as a significant difference because the dangers to the children were inherent in the very circumstances of Calabrese's willingness to testify against members of organized crime.

30 As to some of the federal defendants, the complaint was properly dismissed for the additional reason that they were not alleged to

B. *The State Defendants*

The single assertion against the state defendants is that two state agencies, the Department of Correctional Services and the Parole Board, and certain of their officials, released Calabrese from custody in violation of the law. The children's complaint against these defendants under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 was properly dismissed on grounds of immunity and failure to state a claim.

To the extent that the children assert claims for damages against agencies of the state,[31] they run squarely into the barrier of the Eleventh Amendment. It is well established that that Amendment bars a suit for damages absent the state's consent. *Alabama v. Pugh*, 438 U.S. 781 (1978); *Edelman v. Jordan*, 415 U.S. 651 (1974); *Ford Motor Co. v. Department of Treasury*, 323 U.S. 459, 464 (1945); *see Monell v.*

---

have participated personally in the removal and concealment of the children. Some, *e.g.*, defendant Griffin Bell, were not in office at the time the children were removed. *See* 429 U.S. iv n.2. Some are alleged merely to have been supervisors—*e.g.*, defendant Gerald Shur is alleged generally to have formulated and implemented procedures and methodology. Public officials may be held responsible only to the extent that they caused the plaintiff's rights to be violated; they cannot be held liable for violations committed by their subordinates or predecessors in office. *Johnson v. Glick*, 481 F.2d 1028, 1033-34 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 414 U.S. 1033 (1973); *Sostre v. McGinnis*, 442 F.2d 178, 189 (2d Cir. 1971) (en banc), *cert. denied*, 404 U.S. 1049, 405 U.S. 978 (1972).

31 As noted earlier, the assertions against the state defendants are found in the complaint's description of the parties rather than in any of the twelve separately stated claims for relief. It appears that plaintiffs nevertheless intended to assert claims against these defendants. However, at the hearing below, they requested permission, in light of recent authority, to withdraw their claims against the state agencies. There appears to have been no good reason for the district court to grant this permission rather than pursuing the course actually followed, of dismissing the claims.

Department of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658, 690 n.54 (1978). While the Eleventh Amendment may permit certain types of prospective injunctive relief, *Ex Parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908), we find no demand for injunctive relief against the state defendants in this action.

Moreover, even assuming that the release of Calabrese violated state law and that the removal of the children violated their constitutional rights, no claim upon which relief can be granted has been stated against either the state agencies or the state officials. Although the complaint asserts that in releasing Calabrese the state defendants acted "in concert with" the federal defendants, it is not alleged that any of these defendants participated in the removal or concealment of the children from Leonhard. Any connection between the mere release of Calabrese and the injuries alleged would be far too tenuous to support a claim against these defendants. *See Martinez v. California*, 444 U.S. 277 (1980); *Sostre v. McGinnis*, 442 F.2d 178, 189-90 (2d Cir. 1971) (en banc), *cert. denied*, 404 U.S. 1049, 405 U.S. 978 (1972).

C. *Giambrone and the City of Buffalo*

Giambrone, unlike the state defendants, is alleged to have participated in the removal and concealment of the children. He is alleged to have done so "under and by the full authority of" the City of Buffalo. For the reasons stated in part A above, however, the complaint fails to state a claim against Giambrone and the City for violation of the children's constitutional rights.

Moreover, even if a viable constitutional claim had been asserted against Giambrone, the dismissal of the action against the City would have been proper because

the complaint does not allege that Giambrone acted pursuant to any official policy, regulation or custom of the City. A municipality cannot be held liable on a § 1983 claim under a respondeat superior theory; it is liable only if federal rights are violated pursuant to its official policy or custom. *Monell v. Department of Social Services, supra*, 436 U.S. at 663 n.7; *Monroe v. Pape, supra*. The assertion that Giambrone acted on the "authority" of the City is merely an allegation of agency, and is insufficient to support a claim against the City.

V. *THE CHILDREN'S OTHER CLAIMS*

In addition to their constitutional claims, the children assert certain non-constitutional claims under the Tucker Act, the Federal Tort Claims Act[32] and common law.[33]

---

32 Despite a casual paragraph in plaintiffs' brief suggesting to the contrary, the complaint does not appear to assert a Tort Claims Act claim on behalf of Leonhard. Leonhard appears to contend in his brief, without significant elaboration, that such a claim has been asserted on his behalf (Brief at 32, 55), and an administrative claim was indeed filed with the Department of Justice claiming that the removal and concealment of the children caused him "severe mental, physical, and emotional injury and damages" in the amount of $1,500,000. To the extent that the complaint intended to assert a tort claim on Leonhard's behalf it failed because the only cause alleged on his behalf against any federal defendants expressly recognizes that the acts performed were discretionary. Suit would thus be barred under 28 U.S.C. § 2680(a) which prevents claims "based upon the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or perform a discretionary function or duty . . . whether or not the discretion involved be abused." Further, even if such a claim were permitted, it would be barred by the two-year period of limitations provided by 28 U.S.C. § 2401(b), since, for the reasons stated above, Leonhard's claims arose not later than 1970.

33 Several such claims are asserted against Calabrese for torts allegedly committed against one or more of the children. We express

APPENDIX A

Opinion of United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit

A. *Tucker Act Claim*

The children's Tucker Act claims are that the Attorney General of the United States, knowing that Calabrese was a convicted felon, consigned the children to the company and association of Calabrese, who caused them mental and physical harm. The children claim that the Attorney General thereby violated the Organized Crime Control Act, and each child seeks damages from the United States under the Tucker Act in the amount of $10,000. Their claim is fatally flawed in several respects.

The United States, of course, "is immune from suit save as it consents to be sued." *E.g., United States v. Sherwood*, 312 U.S. 584, 586 (1941). The Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1346(a)(2) (1976), gives the district courts jurisdiction over civil actions "against the United States, not exceeding $10,000 in amount, founded . . . upon . . . any Act of Congress." This section, however, is merely a jurisdictional provision; "it does not create any substantive right enforceable against the United States for money damages." *United States v. Testan*, 424 U.S. 392, 398 (1976). In order to determine whether any substantive right exists, we must look to the Act of Congress relied on, to find a clear waiver of sovereign immunity. "And it has been said, in a Court of Claims context, that a waiver of the traditional sovereign immunity 'cannot be implied but must be unequivocally expressed.' *United States v. King*, 395 U.S. [1, 4 (1969)]; *Soriano v. United States*, 352 U.S. 270, 276 (1957)." *United States v. Testan, supra*, 424 U.S. at 399.

---

no view on these claims since Calabrese was never served and did not appear.

APPENDIX A

Opinion of United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit

The substantive statute relied on by the children is the Organized Crime Control Act (the "Act"). This Act authorizes the Attorney General to provide for the health, safety and welfare of prospective witnesses, and their families, expected to be called to testify against alleged members of organized crime, whenever in the Attorney General's judgment, such testimony or willingness to testify would place in jeopardy the life or person of the prospective witness or his family. Pub. L. 91-452, Title V, §§ 501-504, 84 Stat. 933 (Oct. 15, 1970).[34] The initial problem with the children's claim is

---

34 The Act provides as follows:

Sec. 501. The Attorney General of the United States is authorized to provide for the security of Government witnesses, potential Government witnesses, and the families of Government witnesses and potential witnesses in legal proceedings against any person alleged to have participated in an organized criminal activity.

Sec. 502. The Attorney General of the United States is authorized to rent, purchase, modify, or remodel protected housing facilities and to otherwise offer to provide for the health, safety, and welfare of witnesses and persons intended to be called as Government witnesses, and the families of witnesses and persons intended to be called as Government witnesses in legal proceedings instituted against any person alleged to have participated in an organized criminal activity whenever, in his judgment, testimony from, or a willingness to testify by, such a witness would place his life or person, or the life or person of a member of his family or household, in jeopardy. Any person availing himself of an offer by the Attorney General to use such facilities may continue to use such facilities for as long as the Attorney General determines the jeopardy to his life or person continues.

Sec. 503. As used in this title, "Government" means the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States, any political subdivision, or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof. The offer of facilities to witnesses may be conditioned by the Attorney General upon reimbursement in whole or in part of the United States by any State or any political subdivision, or

that the Act contains no suggestion that Congress intended to waive the government's immunity to a suit for failure to provide protection against reprisals or to create any private right of action for such a failure.[35] Moreover, even if some right of action were inferable, it could not be presumed that Congress intended to permit members of the family of the witness to sue the United States for injuries inflicted upon them by the witness. The risk that the witness may thereafter abuse members of his family is simply not one of the dangers sought to be eliminated by the Act. Finally, the Act was not in effect at the pertinent times. The children were removed and first given new identities in 1967; and according to Rochelle's affidavit, the government's participation in their concealment ended in July 1970. The Organized Crime Control Act was not passed until October 15, 1970. There is no indication that Congress intended to create any rights in favor of the family of a witness who had already testified in the past and had been shielded from organized crime for as long as the government felt necessary.

---

any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof of the cost of maintaining and protecting such witnesses.

Sec. 504. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such funds as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

35 This may not, however, leave the witness without remedy for injuries suffered as a result of reprisals for his assistance to the government. If there was an express or implied contract for his protection the United States would be amenable to suit for its breach, either in a district court if the claim was for $10,000 or less, or in the United States Court of Claims. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(a)(2), 1491. Or, a claim that the government was negligent in failing adequately to protect the witness from reprisals might be brought in district court under the Tort Claims Act. *See Swanner v. United States*, 309 F. Supp. 1183 (M.D. Ala. 1970). *See* part V. B. *infra*.

For all of these reasons, the Tucker Act claims were properly dismissed.

B. *Tort Claims Against the United States*

The children's tort claims against the United States are somewhat similar to their Tucker Act claims. They allege that in arranging for the release of Calabrese and undertaking to conceal and support the children, the government undertook a duty to protect them from mental and physical harm. Reading the complaint in conjunction with the plaintiffs' administrative claim forms, it appears that the children claim that the United States negligently breached this duty by allowing them to be assaulted, battered, deprived of proper care and education, and mentally abused, by Calabrese. Each of the children seeks $500,000 in damages from the United States under the Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2674 (1976).

For tort claims, as for contract or statutory claims, the United States may be sued only to the extent that it has waived its sovereign immunity. The waiver for tort claims is limited both in substantive scope and in duration. The temporal constraints that Congress has placed on the government's vulnerability to tort suits are found in 28 U.S.C. § 2401(b) (1976). Section 2402(b) provides in pertinent part that "[a] tort claim against the United States shall be forever barred unless it is presented in writing to the appropriate Federal agency within two years after such claim accrues . . . ."[36] It is

---

[36] Section 2401(b) also provides that such a claim is barred "unless action is begun within six months after the date of mailing, by certified or registered mail, of notice of final denial of the claim by the agency to which it was presented." Section 2675(a), a provision of the Tort Claims Act which prohibits suit unless a claim has been

firmly established that the two-year period is not tolled by a claimant's minority. *E.g., Smith v. United States*, 588 F.2d 1209, 1211 (8th Cir. 1978); *Simon v. United States*, 244 F.2d 703 (5th Cir. 1957); *United States v. Glenn*, 231 F.2d 884 (9th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 352 U.S. 926 (1956); *Hoch v. Carter*, 242 F. Supp. 863 (S.D.N.Y. 1965).

The children's tort claims were filed with the government on June 27, 1977. The effect of the two-year limitation provided by § 2401(b) is thus to bar recovery by the children on any tort claim that accrued prior to June 27, 1975. To the extent that their tort claims against the United States accrued prior to that date, they were properly dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

It is unclear whether this disposition leaves any tort claims for the children to prosecute against the United States.[37] Rochelle's affidavit states that the children lived with Calabrese only "until June 1975," and does not specify the date their cohabitation ceased. The complaint asserts that Calabrese unlawfully imprisoned the children until July 4, 1975. Even on the assumption that Calabrese may have falsely imprisoned the

---

finally denied by the appropriate agency, provides that "[t]he failure of an agency to make final disposition of a claim within six months after it is filed shall, at the option of the claimant any time thereafter, be deemed a final denial of the claim for purposes of this section." The government has never responded to the tort claims filed by the plaintiffs in 1977. Hence the six-month provision of § 2401(b) does not impede the present suit. *See Mack v. United States Postal Service*, 414 F. Supp. 504, 508-08 (E.D. Mich. 1976).

37 Two claims that Calabrese assaulted Karen Leonhard assert that those assaults occurred in 1970 and February 1975. To the extent that these alleged acts form the basis for tort claims against the United States, such claims are time-barred.

children at any time between June 27, 1975 and July 4, 1975, however, the Tort Claims Act bars the children's recovery on such a claim.

With certain exceptions, the United States has consented to be liable for its torts only "to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances."[38] 28 U.S.C. § 2674. Thus, it has not consented to be liable for injuries which its negligence has not proximately caused. *See, e.g., Beesley v. United States*, 364 F.2d 194 (10th Cir. 1966); *United States v. Shively*, 345 F.2d 294 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 382 U.S. 883 (1965); *United States v. Hutchins*, 268 F.2d 69 (6th Cir. 1959). Both the character and the timing of the events alleged require a dismissal of the children's claims. The government acts complained of are arranging the release of Calabrese and arranging for the children to live with him. The charge, of course, ignores the facts that Rochelle had custody of the children and that she was married to Calabrese. The government did not impose the requirement that the children live with Calabrese; they were already part of the same family unit and had lived together prior to Calabrese's imprisonment. Moreover, despite the reiteration by plaintiffs that Calabrese was a convicted felon, there is no evidence in the record to suggest that he had a history of child abuse or neglect; the crime for which he was imprisoned was robbery.[39] And in any event, the

---

38 Certain limitations on this vulnerability are included in § 2674 itself, *e.g.*, the government is not liable for punitive damages. Other exceptions to the government's liability are carved out in § 2680, *e.g.*, the government is not liable for the intentional torts of its employees.

39 These facts distinguish cases in which the government was held accountable because it could easily have been expected, knowing the

protection of family members from each other is not the kind of duty assumed in the program to protect government informers who testify against organized crime. Finally, although the acts of Calabrese which may form the basis for the tort claims against the government may have occurred between June 27, 1975 and July 4, 1975, the last overt act of the government occurred half a decade earlier: Rochelle's affidavit reveals that the government's last acts in supporting and concealing the children occurred in July 1970.

Thus we find the acts of the government in arranging Calabrese's release in 1968, and concealing him and the children through July 1970 to protect them from reprisals by organized crime, too remote from the claims that in 1975 Calabrese unlawfully imprisoned the children. *See* W. Prosser, *Handbook of the Law of Torts* § 51, at 322 (3d ed. 1964); *cf. Martinez v. California, supra.*

Finally, the United States cannot be held liable for failure to continue to support the children and Calabrese past 1970 or to conduct minute supervision over their daily lives. Such decisions are clearly matters of discretion, and the government has not consented to

> [a]ny claim based upon . . . the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or perform a

---

history or character of the perpetrator of the assault, to foresee the assault which occurred. *See, e.g., United States v. Muniz*, 374 U.S. 150 (1963) (federal prisoner beaten by other prisoners); *Downs v. United States*, 522 F.2d 990 (6th Cir. 1975) (pilot killed by hijacker when FBI refused hijacker's demands); *Rogers v. United States*, 397 F.2d 12 (4th Cir. 1968) (probationer tortured while in custody of a person previously indicted for chaining and physically abusing another); *Fair v. United States*, 234 F.2d 288 (5th Cir. 1956) (decedents killed by psychotic officer released by Air Force). *See also Swanner v. United States, supra* (government informer's house bombed after he agreed to testify).

discretionary function or duty on the part of a federal agency or an employee of the Government, whether or not the discretion involved be abused.

28 U.S.C. § 2680(a) (1976).

C. *Tort Claims Against Others*

The complaint contains one common law tort claim on behalf of the children against certain unidentified individuals. It is asserted that these individuals abducted the children from Leonhard in August 1967 and continued to harbor them from him until July 1975.[40] The claim does not appear to be sustainable.

It is clear that in 1967 Rochelle had lawful custody of the children; Leonhard did not have custody but only visitation rights. It is also clear that Rochelle consented to the removal and concealment of the children, along with the removal and concealment of herself, and that the children always resided with her. Her affidavit makes it clear beyond cavil that her, and the children's, removal and concealment were entirely voluntary. In these circumstances the children have no claim for

---

40 Paragraph 68 alleges as follows:

> On or about the 15th day of August, 1967, at 66 Normal Street, Upper, Buffalo, New York, and continuing up and until the 4th day of July, 1975, at 1575 Wedekind Street, Apartment C. Reno, Nevada, the defendant herein, and a number of unknown agents of the United States Department of Justice and United States Marshal's Service, Robert Dolon Peloquin, Dennis P. O'Keefe, James R. Richards, Robert C. Steward and Robert G. Ryan, did entice, abduct and harbor the plaintiffs, Michael, Karen and Stephan Leonhard, from their natural father, the plaintiff, Thomas Leonhard, and as a result the plaintiffs herein did suffer extreme shock, apprehension and mental and physical anguish and distress.
>
> Principles of pendent jurisdiction are invoked.

abduction or false imprisonment.[41] *See, e.g., Restatement (Second) of Torts* § 700, comment *c* (1976); *id.* § 892A, comment *b* (1977); *id.* § 703, comments *a*, *e* (1976). *Cf. Dale v. State*, 44 A.D.2d 384, 355 N.Y.S.2d 485 (3d Dep't 1974), *aff'd mem.*, 36 N.Y.2d 833, 331 N.E.2d 686, 370 N.Y.S.2d 906 (1975); *Anonymous v. State*, 17 A.D.2d 495, 236 N.Y.S.2d 88 (3d Dep't), *leave to appeal denied*, 13 N.Y.2d 598, 245 N.Y.S.2d 1025 (1963).

CONCLUSION

The dismissals of all claims are affirmed. We instruct the Clerk of the district court to correct the September 24, 1979, judgment nunc pro tunc in accordance with the November 19, 1979, instructions of the district judge.

No costs.

---

41 Technically, and with etymological soundness, it appears that at common law there is no cause of action for abduction on behalf of the child abducted; that claim belongs to the parent who had custody of the child. *See generally* W. Prosser, *Handbook of the Law of Torts* § 118, at 905-06 (3d ed. 1964). The abducted child's claim would be for false imprisonment. *See Robalina v. Armstrong*, 15 Barb. 247 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. Fulton Co. 1852).

The claim for abduction quoted in note 40 *supra* is asserted only on behalf of the children; no such claim has been asserted on behalf of Leonhard. It seems clear, however, that Leonhard could not prevail on an abduction claim because he was not entitled to custody of the children. *See, e.g., Aberlin v. Zisman*, 244 F.2d 620 (1st Cir.) (action by non-custodian father for abduction against child's maternal aunt and uncle dismissed, applying New York law, where aunt had been awarded temporary custody), *cert. denied*, 355 U.S. 857 (1957); *McGrady v. Rosenbaum*, 62 Misc.2d 182, 308 N.Y.S.2d 181 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Co. 1970) (where child's mother has legal custody, father has no cause of action against mother's parents for aiding mother in keeping child away from father), *aff'd*, 37 A.D.2d 917, 324 N.Y.S.2d 876 (1st Dep't 1971). *See also Pickle v. Page*, 252 N.Y. 474, 169 N.E. 650 (1930) (sheriff who took child from its adoptive parents at the instance of the natural mother held liable for abduction).

APPENDIX A
Order of United States District Court
Western District of New York
Dated November 10, 1980

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, Individually and THOMAS S. LEONHARD, as Natural Parent and Legal Guardian of: MICHAEL LEONHARD, etc.,

Plaintiff

v.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Defendants

Civ-78-357

A certified copy of the mandate of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit dated August 28, 1980, having been filed in the office of the Clerk of this court on November 10, 1980, it is hereby

ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that said mandate be, and hereby is, made the judgment of this court.

John T. Curtin
JOHN T. CURTIN
Chief United States District Judge

Dated: November 10, 1980

APPENDIX A
Corrected Judgment of United States District Court Western District of New York Dated November 10, 1980

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

CIVIL ACTION FILE NO. 78-357

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, Individually and THOMAS S. LEONHARD, as Natural Parent and Legal Guardian of MICHAEL LEONHARD, etc.

vs.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; et al.

Pursuant to the opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, filed in this court on November 10, 1980,

It is Ordered and Adjudged that the judgment entered in this court on September 24, 1979, is corrected nunc pro tunc to read that the complaint is dismissed as to all of the federal defendants, as to the City of Buffalo, and also as to Defendant Samuel Giambrone.

Dated at Buffalo, New York, this 10th day of November, 1980.

/s/ JOHN K. ADAMS
Clerk of Court

FILED
NOV 10 3:27 PM '80
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
W.D. OF N.Y.

APPENDIX A
Judgment of United States District Court
Western District of New York
Dated September 24, 1979

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

CIVIL ACTION FILE NO. 78-357

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, Individually and THOMAS S. LEONHARD, as Natural Parent and Legal Guardian of: MICHAEL LEONHARD etc.

vs.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; et al.

This action came on for hearing before the Court, Honorable Harold P. Burke, United States District Judge, presiding, and the issues having been duly heard and a decision having been duly rendered,

It is Ordered and Adjudged that the complaint is dismissed as to all of the federal defendants.

The complaint is dismissed as against the City of Buffalo.

Dated at Buffalo, New York, this 24th day of September, 1979.

JOHN K. ADAMS
Clerk of Court

APPENDIX A
Opinion of United States District Court
Western District of New York
Dated September 21, 1979

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, Individually, and THOMAS S. LEONHARD as Natural Parent and Legal Guardian of: MICHAEL LEONHARD, An Infant, STEPHAN LEONHARD, An Infant, and KAREN LEONHARD, An Infant,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; HON. GRIFFIN BELL, and His Predecessors in Office, To and Including HON. JOHN MITCHELL, Individually and in their Official Capacity; THOMAS A. KENNELLY, Individually and in his Official Capacity; GERALD SHUR, Individually and in his Official Capacity; BENJAMIN R. CIVILETTI, Individually and in his Official Capacity; THE UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE; WAYNE B. COLBURN, Individually and in his Official Capacity; FIVE UNKNOWN AGENTS OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Individually and in their Official Capacity, JOHN CAMERON, Individually and in His Official Capacity; THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES; BENJAMIN WARD, and His Predecessors in Office from 1967, Individually and in Their Official Capacity; THE NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF PAROLE; EUGENE HAMMOCK, and His Predecessors in Office from 1967, Individually and in Their Official Capacity; THE CITY OF BUFFALO; SAMUEL

APPENDIX A
Opinion of United States District Court
Western District of New York
Dated September 21, 1979

GIAMBRONE, Individually and in His Official Capacity; and PASCAL CALABRESE, Individually and in his Official Capacity,

Defendants

Salvatore R. Martoche
300 Statler Office Building
Buffalo, N.Y. 14202
Attorney for plaintiffs

Thomas J. Burns
Assistant United States Attorney
for the federal defendants

Joseph P. McNamara
Corporation Counsel
1100 City Hall
Buffalo, N.Y. 14202
Attorney for defendant City of Buffalo

By notice of motion with supporting papers filed September 18, 1978, the federal defendants move to dismiss the complaint. By notice of motion with supporting papers filed July 28, 1978 the defendant City of Buffalo moves to dismiss the action on the ground that the complaint fails to state a claim against the City of Buffalo.

This is an action seeking declaratory, injunctive and monetary relief from various defendants including the United States and several present and former federal officials. It is based upon the charge that the plaintiff was kept from his children of a prior marriage because their new family was given protection under the Federal Witness Protection Program.

APPENDIX A
Opinion of United States District Court
Western District of New York
Dated September 21, 1979

Several years ago, plaintiff Thomas Leonhard sought to compel disclosure of the location of his children. This court (Henderson, J.) refused to grant his request. The district court decision was upheld by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in *Leonhard vs. Mitchell*, 473 F.2d. 709 (2 cir. 1973), *cert. denied*, 412 U.S. 749 (1973).

The facts upon which plaintiff Thomas Leonhard relied on for relief are identical to the facts on which he asserts here. The facts are set forth at some length in Judge Kaufman's decision 473 F.2d. 710-712. The court said at pages 710-712, "In sum, the extraordinary factual posture of this case indicates that Kennelly, rather than having abused a discretionary power which he held, acted in good faith in attempting to balance two competing interests; Thomas Leonhard's natural wish to be reunited with his children, and Rochelle Calabrese's equally natural desire to protect the children from serious harm or even death."

After concluding that there was no duty running from the United States or the individual federal defendants to the plaintiff, the court specifically held that there was "no violation of statutory or constitutional rights."

Defendant argues that collateral estoppel is inapplicable here since this case involves a different cause of action and different parties. It is not the nature of the cause of action which determines the applicability of collateral estoppel, but the ultimate determination. In the earlier action, plaintiff sought mandamus; in this case, the plaintiffs seek declaratory relief as well as money damages. The operative facts are the same, and the earlier conclusions of no duty and no violation require a dismissal. *Siegel vs. National Periodical Productions, Inc.*, 508 F.2d. 909, 913 (2 cir. 1974). With respect to the additional parties,

who were not plaintiffs in the earlier action, there is no requirement that there be mutuality of estoppel for the doctrine to apply. *Blonder-Tongue Laboratories, Inc. vs. University of Illinois Foundation*, 402 U.S. 313, 328-339 (1971); *Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corp. vs. Hogan*, 476 F.2d. 1182 (7 cir. 1973); *Zdanok vs. Glidden Company*, 327 F.2d. 944, 954-956 (2 cir. 1964), *cert. denied* 377 U.S. 934.

This action is barred by the statute of limitations. *Regan vs. Sullivan*, 557 F.2d. 300 (2 cir. 1977).

Plaintiffs failed to file their administrative claims timely.

While conceding that in the earlier case, *Leonhard vs. Mitchell*, 473 F.2d. 709 (2 cir. 1973), there was no common law constitutional duty to disclose the location of the children, plaintiffs argue that such a duty arose in 1978 under the case of *Quilloin vs. Wolcott*, 98 Sup. Ct. 549 (1978). Plaintiffs bring themselves squarely within the holding of the Supreme Court in *Procunier vs. Navarette*, 434 U.S. 555 (1978). There the court held that an official cannot be held liable for damages unless the constitutional right he was alleged to have violated was "clearly established" at the time of the alleged violation. Here, even under the plaintiffs' theory, the alleged violations ceased on July 11, 1975. Since there is no clearly established right under the plaintiffs' theory, the individual defendants are entitled to qualified immunity under the dictates of that case. There can be neither a common law nor a constitutional tort action in the absence of a duty running from the alleged tortfeasor to the injured plaintiff(s); alternatively, if such a duty were deemed to be created under the Constitution subsequent to the acts of the officials, they would be entitled to qualified immunity.

APPENDIX A
Opinion of United States District Court
Western District of New York
Dated September 21, 1979

The requirements of res judicata are set out by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in *Herendeen vs. Champion International Corp.*, 525 F.2d. 130 (2 cir. 1975) and *Expert Electric Inc. vs. Levine*, 554 F.2d. 1227 (2 cir. 1977). Parties to an action on which a judgment on the merits was rendered, or their privies, are barred from relitigating the same issues and the same cause of action in a second suit. Where the subsequent suit is based on a different cause of action the doctrine of collateral estoppel renders the prior judgment conclusive as to those issues actually litigated. The requirements for collateral estoppel are the same as those for res judicata; there must have been a valid final judgment on the merits conclusive as to the same parties or their privies regarding the same issues. Whether res judicata or collateral estoppel bars Leonhard's present civil action for damages for an alleged violation of constitutional rights depends on whether the cause of action in the second suit is the same as the cause of action in the first suit. The causes of action alleged are the same. No new facts or issues are alleged in the present suit for damages. The evidence necessary to prove the existence of a duty remains unchanged. The finding of no duty and the lack of any violation of constitutional rights by the Court of Appeals in the earlier action established the rights and interests of the parties. A different judgment in the present action would not only destroy the rights or interests so established but would reverse the findings of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals that there was no duty on the part of the defendants to disclose the whereabouts of the children to Leonhard.

To permit the plaintiffs to proceed with the present action under a guise of a different cause of action would permit the plaintiffs to relitigate those issues which, under law, they are

barred from doing. Pleading additional theories of recovery in a subsequent action does not destroy the underlying identity of the claim.

What the plaintiffs are attempting to do here is similar to cases where a prisoner brings a civil action for damages against the police alleging that his constitutional rights were violated in the course of his arrest and interrogation but where an order had previously been entered in a suppression hearing in a criminal proceeding holding the prisoners' confessions to be valid. In those situations, the decision in the suppression hearing precludes the prisoners' claims for damages on the grounds of collateral estoppel. *Rodriguez vs. Beame*, 423 F.Supp. 906 (S.D.N.Y. 1976); *Williams vs. Halpern*, 360 F.Supp. 554 (S.D.N.Y. 1973).

Even if this court should hold that the causes of action in the two lawsuits differ, the present action is still barred by the doctrine of collateral estoppel which precludes relitigation of the same issues in a subsequent suit based on a different cause of action. In this regard, the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit confines the application of collateral estoppel to "situations where the matter raised in the second suit is identical in all respects with that decided in the first proceeding and where the controlling facts and applicable legal rules remain unchanged." *Neaderland vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 424 F.2d. 639, 642 (2 cir. 1970, *cert. denied*, 400 U.S. 827 (1970). Another requirement is that the matter raised in the second case involves "substantially 'the same bundle of legal principles that contributed to the rendering of the first judgment'." Clearly, the present action brought by Leonhard meets this test; the issues are identical as are the controlling facts. Although plaintiff argues that the applicable legal rules with respect to con-

stitutional rights were changed by a judicial decision, (Quilloin, supra), this assertion does not destroy the applicability of collateral estoppel.

Plaintiff Leonhard was afforded a "full and fair opportunity" to litigate the issue of whether the government owed him a duty to disclose the whereabouts of the Calabrese family. The issue was decided against him and he is not entitled to relitigate it here simply by virtue of the fact that he brings his infant children into the action in his capacity as guardian ad litem. Even though the infant children were not named parties in the earlier action, they are bound by the finding of no duty because the findings of no duty to the father to disclosed the whereabouts of the children presupposes a finding of duty to the children to disclose their whereabouts.

The complaint is dismissed as to all of the federal defendants.

The complaint is dismissed as against the City of Buffalo. *Monroe vs. Pape*, 365 U.S. 167 (1961).

ALL OF THE ABOVE IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ HAROLD P. BURKE
Harold P. Burke
United States District Judge

September 21, 1979.

APPENDIX A
Judgment of United States District Court
Western District of New York
Dated October 29, 1979

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Thomas S. Leonhard etc. et al.

vs.

United States Department of Justice, Hon. Griffin Bell etc. et al.

CIVIL ACTION FILE NO. 78-357

This action came on for trial (hearing) before the Court, Honorable Harold P. Burke, United States District Judge, presiding, and the issues having been duly tried (heard) and a decision having been duly rendered,

It is Ordered and Adjudged that this complaint is dismissed against Defts' Benjamin Ward, Edward Hammock, The New York State Board of Parole and the New York State Dept. of Correctional Services upon the ground that the complaint makes no allegation to which constitutionally protected rights of the Pltfs. were violated.

Dated at Buffalo, New York, this 29th day of October, 1979.

/s/ JOHN K. ADAMS
John K. Adams
Clerk of Court

APPENDIX A
Opinion of United States District Court
Western District of New York
Dated October 25, 1979

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, Individually, and THOMAS S. LEONHARD as natural parent and legal guardian of: MICHAEL LEONHARD, An Infant, STEPHAN LEONHARD, An Infant, and KAREN LEONHARD, An Infant,

Plaintiffs,

vs

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; HON. GRIFFIN BELL, and His Predecessors in Office, To and Including HON. JOHN MITCHELL, Individually and in their Official Capacity; THOMAS A. KENNELLY, Individually and in his Official Capacity; GERALD SHUR, Individually and in his Official Capacity; BENJAMIN R. CIVILETTI, Individually and in his Official Capacity; THE UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE; WAYNE B. COLBURN, Individually and in his Official Capacity; FIVE UNKNOWN AGENTS OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Individually and in their Official Capacity, JOHN CAMERON, Individually and his Official Capacity; THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES; BENJAMIN WARD, and His Predecessors in Office from 1967, Individually and in their Official Capacity; THE NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF PAROLE; EUGENE HAMMOCK, and His Predecessors in Office from 1967; THE CITY OF BUFFALO; SAMUEL GIAMBRONE, Individually and in his

APPENDIX A
Opinion of United States District Court
Western District of New York
Dated October 25, 1979

Official Capacity; and PASCAL CALABRESE, Individually and in his Official Capacity,

Defendants

Salvatore R. Martoche
300 Statler Office Building
Buffalo, N.Y. 14202
Attorney for plaintiffs

Douglas S. Cream
Assistant Attorney General of New York
65 Court Street
Buffalo, N.Y. 14202
Attorney for defendants, Ward, Hammock, the New York State Board of Parole and the New York State Department of Correctional Services

By notice of motion with supporting papers dated November 21, 1978 the defendants Ward, Edward Hammock, the New York State Board of Parole and the New York State Department of Correctional Services, move to dismiss the complaint pursuant to Rule 12, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, upon the grounds set forth in the affidavit of Douglas S. Cream sworn to November 21, 1978.

On due consideration the motion is granted. The complaint is dismissed against the defendants Ward, Edward Hammock, The New York State Board of Parole and the New York State Department of Correctional Services upon the ground that the complaint makes no allegation as to which constitutionally protected rights of the plaintiffs were violated, the plaintiffs are without standing to bring this suit for failure to allege that any

APPENDIX A
Opinion of United States District Court
Western District of New York
Dated October 25, 1979

constitutionally protected rights were violated by the acts of the defendants, the complaint alleges no cause of action against the State defendants upon which relief can be granted pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Section 1983, the doctrine of respondeat superior may not be used as a basis upon which to grant relief against a defendant in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. 1983, the acts complained of occurred more than ten years prior to filing of the complaint, the complaint is barred by the statute of limitations, the defendant State agencies are not liable to suit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1983, the defendant agencies of the State of New York are immune from liability by virtue of the Eleventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, all of the defendants are immune from liability under the doctrine of good faith immunity.

ALL OF THE ABOVE IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ HAROLD P. BURKE
Harold P. Burke
United States District Judge

October 25, 1979

APPENDIX A
Letter of Hon. Harold P. Burke
Dated November 19, 1979

November 19, 1979

John K. Adams
Clerk, U.S. District Court
604 U.S. Court House
Buffalo, New York 14202

Re: Thomas S. Leonard, etc. et al vs. The United States of America, et al. Civil 78-357.

Dear Sir:

This letter is your authority to correct a typographical error in the decision herein dated September 21, 1979. The last paragraph on page 8 should be amended by adding, "and defendant Samuel Giambrone, individually and in his official capacity." The parties may conform their copy of the decision accordingly.

Very truly yours,
/s/ HAROLD P. BURKE
Harold P. Burke
U.S. District Judge

APPENDIX B

Constitutional Provisions and Statutes Involved

APPENDIX B
Constitutional Provisions and Statutes Involved

Constitutional Provisions

Amendment I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment V

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment IX

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

APPENDIX B
Constitutional Provisions and Statutes Involved

Amendment XIV, Sections 1 and 5

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; or shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

Statutory Provisions

42 U.S.C. §1983

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress.

28 U.S.C. §2401

(a) Every civil action commenced against the United States shall be barred unless the complaint is filed within six years after the right of action first accrues. The action of any person under legal disability or beyond the seas at the time the claim accrues may be commenced within three years after the disability ceases.

(b) A tort claim against the United State shall be forever barred unless it is presented in writing to the appropriate Federal agency within two years after such claim accrues or unless action is begun within six months after the date of mailing, by certified or registered mail, of notice of final denial of the claim by the agency to which it was presented.

28 U.S.C. §2674

The United States shall be liable, respecting the provisions of this title relating to tort claims, in the same manner and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances, but shall not be liable for interest prior to judgment or for punitive damages.

If, however, in any case wherein death was caused, the law of the place where the act or omission complained of occurred provides, or has been construed to provide, for damages only punitive in nature, the United States shall be liable for actual or compensatory damages, measured by the pecuniary injuries resulting from such death to the persons respectively, for whose benefit the action was brought, in lieu

Public Law 91-452, Title V, §§501-504, 84 Stat. 933 (1970)

Sec. 501. The Attorney General of the United States is authorized to provide for the security of Government witnesses, potential Government witnesses, and the families of Government witnesses and potential witnesses in legal proceedings against any person alleged to have participated in an organized criminal activity.

Sec. 502. The Attorney General of the United States is authorized to rent, purchase, modify, or remodel protected housing facilities and to otherwise offer to provide for the health,

safety, and welfare of witnesses and persons intended to be called as Government witnesses, and the families of witnesses and persons intended to be called as Government witnesses in legal proceedings instituted against any person alleged to have participated in an organized criminal activity whenever, in his judgment, testimony from, or a willingness to testify by, such a witness would place his life or person, or the life or person of a member of his family or household, in jeopardy. Any person availing himself of an offer by the Attorney General to use such facilities may continue to use such facilities for as long as the Attorney General determines the jeopardy to his life or person continues.

Sec. 503. As used in this title, "Government" means the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States, any political subdivision, or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof. The offer of facilities to witnesses may be conditioned by the Attorney General upon reimbursement in whole or in part of the United States by any State or any political subdivision, or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof of the cost of maintaining and protecting such witnesses.

Sec. 504. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such funds as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

Office-Supreme
FILED
MAR 25
ALEXANDER L.
CLERK

No. 80-1260

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1980

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, *et al.*,
Petitioners,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,
Respondents.

BRIEF OF RESPONDENTS CITY OF BUFFALO AND SAMUEL GIAMBRONE IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

JOSEPH P. McNAMARA
Corporation Counsel
Attorney for Respondents
City of Buffalo and
Samuel Giambrone
1100 City Hall
No. 65 Niagara Square
Buffalo, New York 14202

ANTHONY C. VACCARO
Assistant Corporation Counsel
Of Counsel

Batavia Times Publishing Co.
Batavia, N.Y. (716) 344-2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page
Preliminary Statement	1
Point I. The Court below correctly stated the law in this case	2
Point II. Plaintiffs are estopped from objecting to the dismissal against Giambrone	2
Point III. That based on the law and the facts as set forth there is no basis for this Court to grant a Writ of Certiorari as requested	3

CASE CITED.

Monell v. Department of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658	2

RULES.

Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 9-d	2
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 54	3

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1980

No. 80-1260

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, *et al.*,
Petitioners,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,
Respondents.

BRIEF OF RESPONDENTS CITY OF BUFFALO AND SAMUEL GIAMBRONE IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

Preliminary Statement

The Defendants City of Buffalo and Sergeant Samuel Giambrone feel the Statement of Facts of this particular action have been adequately set forth in the opinion of Circuit Judge Kearse of the United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, which is set forth in Pages A-11, etc. of Petitioners' Appendix. The facts as set forth by the Plaintiffs will suffice at this time and are adequate so that these Defendants can submit this Brief.

POINT I

The Court below correctly stated the law in this case.

The Rules of Civil Procedure provide in Rule 9-d that an averment that an official act was done in compliance with law is sufficient. However, it does not do away with the basic Hornbook rule of pleading that requires a plaintiff to plead facts and not conclusions or bare allegations as pointed out by the United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit (Page A-38 of the Appendix).

The City of Buffalo's actions can only be those performed through the activities of Defendant Samuel Giambrone. Those actions are the allegations set forth by the Court of Appeals at Page A-51 of the Appendix and labeled them a mere allegation.

Further, the Court correctly pointed out at Pages A-50 and 51 that even these bare allegations do not claim that Defendant Giambrone acted pursuant to any "official policy, regulation or custom of the City" as required by the holding of *Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658.

POINT II

Plaintiffs are estopped from objecting to the dismissal against Giambrone.

The Plaintiffs herein are estopped from objecting to the dismissal of the claim against Defendant Giambrone. It was the Plaintiffs, through their counsel, who requested of District Judge Burke that the complaint against Giambrone be dismissed. They point out at Pages 10-11 of the Petition that Giambrone did not move for dismissal of the complaint. In fact it was after Plaintiffs learned that their appeal was subject to dismissal

on the ground that it was premature pursuant to Rule 54 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that they, through their counsel, implored the Honorable District Court Judge, on Plaintiffs' motion, without a hearing or notice to the parties that he add Defendant Giambrone to the list of those defendants against whom dismissals were granted. To imply to this Court that the dismissal of the complaint against Giambrone was either a surprise or prejudicial to the Plaintiffs without setting forth before this Court the true facts leading to the dismissal is an attempt to mislead the Court.

POINT III

That based on the law and the facts as set forth there is no basis for this Court to grant a Writ of Certiorari as requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH P. McNAMARA
Corporation Counsel
Attorney for Respondents
City of Buffalo and
Samuel Giambrone
1100 City Hall
No. 65 Niagara Square
Buffalo, New York 14202

ANTHONY C. VACCARO
Assistant Corporation Counsel
Of Counsel

No. 80-1260

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1980

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, et al.,

Petitioners,

against

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Respondents.

BRIEF FOR STATE RESPONDENTS IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

ROBERT ABRAMS
Attorney General of the
State of New York
Attorney for New York State Respondents
Office and P.O. Address
Two World Trade Center
New York, New York 10047
Tel. No. (212) 488-3105

SHIRLEY ADELSON SIEGEL
Solictor General

GERALD J. RYAN
Assistant Attorney General
Of Counsel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Cases Cited	ii
Questions Presented	1
Opinions Below	2
Jurisdiction	2
Statement of the Case	2
ARGUMENT—Petitioners present no grounds for certiorari	3
I. Petitioners' Claims Do Not Rise to a Constitutional Level	3
II. Petitioner Leonhard's Suit Is Time-Barred	4
III. The Eleventh Amendment Bars Maintenance of Petitioners' Suit	5
IV. The Petitioners Allege No Personal Involvement By the State Respondents	6
V. The Petitioners Have Failed to Adequately Present Reasons For the Supreme Court to Issue a Writ of Certiorari	7
Conclusion	8

PAGE

Adickes v. *S.H. Kress & Co.*, 398 U.S. 144 (1970) .. 3

Alabama v. *Pugh*, 438 U.S. 781 (1978) 5

Board of Regents v. *Tomanio*, 446 U.S. 478 (1980) 5

Boothe v. *Hammock*, 605 F. 2d 661 (2d Cir. (1979) 4

Briley v. *California*, 564 F.2d 849 (9th Cir. (1977) 5

Competitive Associates Inc. v. *Fantastic Fudges, Inc.* 58 F.R.D. 121 (D.C. N.Y. 1973) 5

Edelman v. *Jordan*, 415 U.S. 651 (1974) 5

Ford Motor Company v. *Department of Treasury*, 323 U.S. 459 (1945) 6

Greenholtz v. *Inmates of the Nebraska Penal and Correctional Complex, et al.*, 442 U.S. 1 (1979) 4

Johnson v. *Glick*, 481 F.2d 1028 (2d Cir.), cert. den., 414 U.S. 1033 (1973) 6

Johnson v. *Railway Express Agency*, 421 U.S. 454 (1980) 5

Martinez v. *California*, 444 U.S. 277 (1980) 6

Monell v. *Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978) 5

Quern v. *Jordan*, 440 U.S. 332 (1979) 5

Quinn v. *Syracuse Model Neighborhood Corporation*, 613 F.2d 438 (2d Cir. 1980) 5

Rizzo v. *Goode*, 423 U.S. 362 (1976) 6

Taylor v. *Mayone*, 626 F.2d 247 (2d Cir. 1980) 5

STATUTES AND RULES CITED

Constitution of the United States PAGE

Eleventh Amendment 1, 5, 6, 7

28 U.S.C. § 1254 (1) 2

42 U.S.C. § 1983 .....3, 4, 5, 6, 7

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

Rule 12 3

New York State Corrections Law

§ 281 (3) 3

New York Executive Law

§ 259-C 4 4

New York Civil Practice Law and Rules

§ 214(2) 5

Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States

Rule 17 7

Rule 19 7

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1980

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, et al.,

Petitioners,

against

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Respondents.

BRIEF FOR STATE RESPONDENTS IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

Questions Presented

Do the petitioners, their children and their natural father, have any actionable claim against the State respondents, who released a prisoner into federal custody in connection with a plan to use his testimony to secure certain convictions, resulting in his obtaining a new identity for himself and the mother of the said children and for them as well, and in the petitioner father's loss of visitation and other parental rights during such period?

If there is any such claim is it barred by the Statute of Limitations and the Eleventh Admendment?

Opinions Below

The opinion of the Court of Appeals, dated August 28, 1980, which affirms the District Court, is reported at 633 F. 2d 599, and it appears in the petition in Appendix "A", at pp. A-8 *et seq.*

The opinion of the District Court, dismissing the claims against the State defendants, is dated October 25, 1979, is not officially reported and is printed in Appendix "A" at pp. A-72 *et seq.*

Jurisdiction

Petitioners seek to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

Statement of the Case

Defendant Calabrese was released from the custody of the New York State Department of Correctional Services upon the granting of his absolute discharge by the state agency defendants. Prior to his discharge in the late 1960's Calabrese was in state custody following his conviction for robbery.

Subsequent to his release, Calabrese joined the Federal Witness Protection Program and, as agreed, he, Rochelle Leonhard and her three children received new identities and were relocated in exchange for his cooperation with federal authorities.

In order to safeguard the welfare of the relocated parties, plaintiff Leonhard was unable to see his children during the period from 1967 to 1975.

Plaintiffs filed a complaint with the United States District Court for the Western District of New York seeking declaratory relief, injunctive relief and monetary damages

against defendants. Upon motions to dismiss brought pursuant to Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the District Court (*Burke*, J.) granted the motions and dismissed the complaint.

The United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, subsequently affirmed the denial of all claims.

ARGUMENT

Petitioners present no grounds for certiorari.

I. Petitioners' Claims Do Not Rise to a Constitutional Level.

The substance of the complaint filed against the New York State Department of Correctional Services, New York State Board of Parole, Benjamin Ward and Eugene Hammock* is that the two latter parties released defendant Calabrese from a New York State Correctional Facility allegedly in violation of the authority and rules of the Parole Board. However, since this claim does not rise to the level of a constitutional violation, the claim is not cognizable by the Supreme Court.

In order to state a valid claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, one must show the deprivation of a federally protected constitutional right. *Adickes* v. *S.H. Kress & Co.*, 398 U.S. 144 (1970). The release of a state prisoner by state authorities is, however, a state matter, and in no way can it be construed as a violation of federally protected right. (Moreover, Calabrese's release was clearly proper under New York State law. Corrections Law, § 281, paragraph 3, in effect at the time of the release, authorized "absolute release and discharge".)

---

* The suit was brought naming *inter alia* Ward and Hammock and their "predecessors in office." At the time of the release of Calabrese, from State custody in 1968, Neither Ward nor Hammock held the public office that he held at the time of the commencement of this suit in 1978.

This Court has held that the possibility of parole release is an interest which is not necessarily entitled to due process protection. *Greenholtz* v. *Inmates of the Nebraska Penal and Correctional Complex, et al.*, 442 U.S. 1 (1979). The Second Circuit, in construing *Greenholtz* in *Boothe v. Hammock*, 605 F. 2d 661, 663, 664 (2d Cir. 1979), found that although a state's statutory scheme for determining parole release can create a protectible expectation of parole, New York's parole provisions do not establish such a scheme. While guidelines are used to structure the exercise of discretion (see New York Executive Law § 258-c4 [McKinney Supp. 1978]), no entitlement to release is created.

Since there is no constitutional protection of parole release in New York, such a release is not reviewable by the Supreme Court. Moreover, decisions of the Executive Branch do not automatically invoke due process protection; "there simply is no constitutional guarantee that all executive decision making must comply with standards that assure error-free determinations. This is especially true with respect to the sensitive choices presented by the administrative decision to grant parole release." *Greenholtz* v. *Nebraska, supra* at 7.

If plaintiffs were injured by the release of Calabrese, such injury would *not* be proximately related to the State defendants' actions, nor could such an injury be foreseen. Therefore, the District Court was correct in dismissing the complaint against the State defendants on the ground that the complaint alleges no cause of action upon which relief can be granted pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and the Second Circuit was correct in affirming that judgment.

II. Petitioner Leonhard's Suit Is Time-Barred.

Leonard asserts that his cause of action is not time-barred. It is well established that in order to ascertain the statute of limitations applicable to a claim made pur-

suant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, one must look to the most appropriate state statute of limitations. *Board of Regents* v. *Tomanio*, 446 U.S. 478, (1980); *Johnson v. Railway Express Agency*, 421 U.S. 454, 462, (1980); *Taylor* v. *Mayone*, 626 F. 2d 247 (2d Cir. 1980); *Quinn* v. *Syracuse Model Neighborhood Corporation*, 613 F. 2d 438, 449 (2d Cir. 1980). Therefore, the statute of limitations under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is the three year period under New York Civil Practice Law and Rules § 214(2).

The doctrine of fraudulent concealment which could toll the limitations period is inapplicable to the State defendants. Since Calabrese's release was always a matter of public record and the State never tried to conceal any facts surrounding the release, plaintiff Leonhard was aware of all the essential elements of his claim at the time of the release ten years ago. *Briley* v. *California*, 564 F. 2d 849 (9th Cir. 1977); *Competitive Associates, Inc.* v. *Fantastic Fudge, Inc.*, 58 F.R.D. 121 (D.C.N.Y. 1973).

Also inapplicable to the State defendants is the "continuous wrong" argument used in claiming a tolling of the statute of limitations. The alleged wrongdoing by these defendants was complete upon the release of Calabrese. In short, the time lapse of more than ten years between the accrual of the cause of action against the State defendants and the commencement of the instant suit renders plaintiff Leonhard's suit time-barred.

III. The Eleventh Amendment Bars Maintenance of Petitioners' Suit.

It is well established that the Eleventh Amendment bars a suit against an unconsenting state or its agencies. *Quern* v. *Jordan*, 440 U.S. 332 (1979); *Alabama* v. *Pugh*, 438 U.S. 781 (1978); *Edelman* v. *Jordan*, 415 U.S. 651 (1974). This principle was reaffirmed in *Monell* v. *Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978), in which the Court avoided, at footnote 54, any holding bringing

states within the sphere of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 or overruling the Eleventh Amendment precedents concerning states.

The named defendants are state agencies which are merely functional expressions of the sovereign and state officials who at the time of the release of Calabrese did not hold those public officers. Therefore, plaintiff's claim, if allowed, amounts to the suing of the State directly for damages. In such a case, the State is entitled to invoke its sovereign immunity from suit. *Ford Motor Company* v. *Department of Treasury,* 323 U.S. 459, 464 (1945). Furthermore, plaintiffs never alleged consent to this suit by the State or its agencies, as is required. *Edelman* v. *Jordan, supra,* at 672-673.

IV. The Petitioners Allege No Personal Involvement by the State Defendants.

Nowhere in the complaint is there any indication that the State defendants were personally involved in the events complained of, or even had personal knowledge of these incidents. There is no specific allegation that any of these defendants participated in the removal or concealment of the children from Leonhard. Any connection between Calabrese's release and the injuries alleged, assuming that there is such a connection, is too tenuous to support a claim against the State defendants. See *Martinez* v. *California,* 444 U.S. 277 (1980).

The plaintffs attempt to impose liability on the theory that some of the individual defendants occupied high positions of authority must be rejected. The doctrine of *respondeat superior* does not apply in a civil rights action and may not be invoked to circumvent the "personal involvement" requirement. *Rizzo* v. *Goode,* 423 U.S. 362, 375-376 (1976); *Johnson* v. *Glick,* 481 F. 2d 1028, 1033-34 (2d Cir.), *cert. den.,* 414 U.S. 1033 (1973). It is the rule that an official will not be held liable in a civil rights action unless he directly participated in the alleged wrongful conduct.

V. The Petitioners Have Failed to Adequately Present Reasons for the Supreme Court to Issue a Writ of Certiorari.

Rules 17 and 19 of the Rules of the Supreme Court serve as a guide for lawyers in deciding whether to file a petition for certiorari. They state the primary reasons which will be considered by the Court. While the standards outlined are neither controlling nor fully indicative of the Court's discretion, they indicate the character of reasons which will compel consideration of a petition.

As shown by the discussion above, there is no substantial federal question involved in this case. Neither do the plaintiffs allege a conflict between the decisions of two courts. In short, the plaintiffs, in their complaint, have not met the suggested guidelines of the Supreme Court Rules.

Since the Eleventh Amendment provides absolute immunity to the New York State Board of Parole and the New York State Department of Correctional Services, the complaint against those two agencies was properly dismissed. Because the doctrine of *respondeat superior* does not apply to Ward and Hammock and they are insulated from § 1983 liability, the complaint against them was properly dismissed. There were proper alternative grounds for dismissal as well, as we have shown, but these grounds alone are dispositive.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the Court should deny the petition for certiorari.

Dated: New York, New York
February 9, 1981

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT ABRAMS
Attorney General of the
State of New York
Attorney for New York State Respondents

SHIRLEY ADELSON SIEGEL
Solictor General

GERALD J. RYAN
Assistant Attorney General
Of Counsel

No. 80-1260

MAR 24 1981
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS
CLERK

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1980

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, ET AL., PETITIONERS

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE FEDERAL RESPONDENTS IN OPPOSITION

WADE H. MCCREE, JR.
Solicitor General

THOMAS S. MARTIN
Acting Assistant Attorney General

ANTHONY J. STEINMEYER
Attorney

Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 633-2217

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether government officials, in protecting a husband, his wife, and the wife's children by a prior marriage from possible retaliation for the husband's testimony against organized crime suspects, violated any rights of the children by declining, at the mother's insistence, to reveal their new location to the natural father.

2. Whether claims against government officials based upon the separation of the natural father from the children are time-barred when the applicable limitations periods elapsed between the government's last act in assisting the relocated family and the filing of the claims.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Opinions below 1

Jurisdiction 1

Statement 1

Argument 6

Conclusion 10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

Baker v. *McCollan*, 443 U.S. 137 8

Barr v. *Matteo*, 360 U.S. 564 8

Briley v. *California*, 564 F. 2d 849 9

Butz v. *Economou*, 438 U.S. 478 8

Leonhard v. *Mitchell*, Civil No. 1971-359 (W.D.N.Y. May 24, 1972), aff'd, 473 F. 2d 709 (*Leonhard I*), cert. denied *sub nom. Leonhard* v. *Richardson*, 412 U.S. 949 ..... 3, 4, 7, 8

Parham v. *J.R.*, 442 U.S. 584 8

United States v. *Kubrick*, 444 U.S. 111 9

Constitution and statute:

United States Constitution:

First Amendment 4

Fourth Amendment 4

Fifth Amendment 4

Ninth Amendment 4

Eleventh Amendment 6

Fourteenth Amendment 4

PREVIOUS PAGE WAS BLANK

Page

Constitution and statute—Continued:

Federal Tort Claims Act:

28 U.S.C. 1346(b) 9
28 U.S.C. 2401(b) 6, 9
28 U.S.C. 2671-2680 9
28 U.S.C. 2680(a) 8

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1980

No. 80-1260

THOMAS S. LEONHARD, ET AL., PETITIONERS

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE FEDERAL RESPONDENTS IN OPPOSITION

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals (Pet. App. A-8 to A-60) is reported at 633 F. 2d 599. The opinion and orders of the district court (Pet. App. A-64 to A-75) are not reported.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on August 28, 1980 (Pet. App. A-6 to A-7). A petition for rehearing was denied on October 24, 1980 (Pet. App. A-1 to A-2). The petition for a writ of certiorari was filed on January 21, 1981. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

STATEMENT

Petitioner Thomas S. Leonhard, suing on behalf of himself and his three children, brought this action for damages against the United States and several of its agencies and

officials in the United States District Court for the Western District of New York.[1] Petitioner alleges that the federal respondents violated his and his children's constitutional rights and committed torts against them by separating Leonhard from his children in 1967 and by refusing to reveal their location to him (Pet. App. A-10 to A-11). Agencies of the State of New York and their officials and former officials were also named as defendants, as was an individual, Pascal Calabrese.

Leonhard and his wife Rochelle were divorced in 1966 (Pet. App. A-11). Rochelle was awarded custody of their three children; Leonhard was given visitation rights (*ibid.*). In 1967 Rochelle married Pascal Calabrese, and she and the children resided with him until he was confined to a New York state prison for robbery (*id.* at A-11 to A-12). Subsequently, Calabrese testified against organized crime suspects in a federal prosecution, after having been promised federal assistance in relocating him and his family with new identities (*id.* at A-12). Later in 1967, federal officials arranged for Calabrese to be transferred to a federal prison and for Rochelle and the children to be moved to a military base (*ibid.*). In 1968, Calabrese was paroled, and respondent Thomas A. Kennelly, a Department of Justice official, arranged for Calabrese, Rochelle, and the children to be moved to a new location and given new identities (*id.* at A-12 to A-13). Thereafter, apparently in 1968 (*id.* at A-35

---

[1]Specifically, the federal respondents are the United States, the Department of Justice, former Attorney General Griffin Bell and his predecessors in office to and including John Mitchell, former Deputy Attorney General Benjamin R. Civiletti, Gerald Shur, Thomas A. Kennelly, the Marshals Service, its former Director Wayne B. Colburn and his predecessors in office to 1967, John Cameron, and five unknown agents of the Department of Justice (Pet. ii). Although petitioners purported to sue all of these federal officials in their individual, as well as official, capacities, many of these officials were not served so as to confer jurisdiction over them in their individual capacities.

n.20), the family moved on its own initiative (*id.* at A-13). At this point, Kennelly became the only person in the government to know the family's identities and location (*ibid.*).

In 1969, Leonhard's attorney contacted Kennelly, who declined to reveal the location of Rochelle and her children (Pet. App. A-13). Rochelle not only consented to Kennelly's refusal to disclose the children's location but insisted upon it (*id.* at A-13, A-45). Kennelly forwarded correspondence between Leonhard and Rochelle but Rochelle refused to allow Leonhard to see the children, even away from their new home, for fear they would reveal their new identities (*id.* at A-13). Rochelle and her children moved again in July 1970, and continued to live without government assistance after that time (*id.* at A-35 & n.20). In June 1971, a New York court entered a default judgment modifying the Leonhards' divorce decree so as to award custody of the three children to Leonhard (*id.* at A-13). Although Rochelle was not served in this action, she did learn of it, and her response was to warn Kennelly that if he revealed her location in any way she and the children would disappear without informing even Kennelly of their new location (*ibid.*).

In July 1971, Leonhard brought an action for mandamus against Kennelly and other officials of the Department of Justice seeking to compel them to disclose the location of his children. The district court denied mandamus, and the court of appeals affirmed. *Leonhard* v. *Mitchell*, Civil No. 1971-359 (W.D.N.Y. May 24, 1972), aff'd, 473 F. 2d 709 (2d Cir. 1973) (*Leonhard I*). The district court and the court of appeals found that Kennelly had acted in good faith and had not abused his discretion by honoring Rochelle's request not to reveal the location of her and her children to Leonhard. See *Leonhard I*, *supra*, 473 F. 2d at 712, 714. The district court held that the federal parties had breached no clear duty to Leonhard (see *id.* at 712), and the court of

appeals agreed, stating that it "found no violation of statutory or constitutional rights." *Id.* at 714. This Court denied certiorari. *Leonhard* v. *Richardson,* 412 U.S. 949 (1973).

In July 1975, Rochelle voluntarily contacted Leonhard, and he and the three children were reunited (Pet. App. A-15). On June 27, 1977, Leonhard and the three children filed administrative claims with the government under the Federal Tort Claims Act (*id.* at A-56). Receiving no decision on those claims, Leonhard instituted this action on June 30, 1978 (*id.* at A-15). Leonhard alleged, on behalf of both himself and his children, that the respondents violated the First, Fourth, Fifth, Ninth, and Fourteenth Amendments by separating and concealing the children from him (*id.* at A-16). On behalf of the children, Leonhard alleged that the federal respondents undertook a duty to protect the children from their step-father, Calabrese, and that they breached this duty (*ibid.*).[2]

The district court dismissed the claims against the federal respondents on the alternative grounds of res judicata, collateral estoppel, statute of limitations, failure to file timely administrative claims, failure to allege a valid claim, and qualified immunity (Pet. App. A-65 to A-70). The district court held that the finding in *Leonhard I* that the federal officials had breached no duty to Leonhard by refusing to disclose the location of his children was fatal to petitioner's present claims (*id.* at A-66, A-70).[3]

---

[2]Petitioner further alleged that respondent Calabrese, who was never served and never appeared in this action (Pet. App. A-17, A-20), committed torts against the children (*id.* at A-16 to A-17). The New York respondents were alleged to have acted in concert with the other respondents in releasing Calabrese from custody in violation of state law (*id.* at A-17).

[3]The complaint was also dismissed as to all the other respondents except Calabrese (Pet. App. A-70, A-71 to A-74, A-75). The court of appeals held that the failure to dismiss the complaint as to Calabrese did not affect its appellate jurisdiction because Calabrese had not been served and had never appeared in the action (*id.* at A-20 to A-22).

The court of appeals affirmed the dismissals as to all respondents (Pet. App. A-8 to A-60). It held that Leonhard's own claims against the federal respondents were time-barred (*id.* at A-30 to A-36). The court determined—and petitioners agree (Pet. 11)—that the most nearly analogous New York statute of limitations applied and that this period was either three or six years (Pet. App. A-36). The court of appeals then stated that there were "persuasive reasons" that "implicate federal interests" for holding that the cause of action accrued when the federal officials first helped conceal the Calabrese family in 1967 (*id.* at A-33 to A-34). The court reasoned that the federal officials' initial agreement to protect the witness and his family necessarily entailed a commitment not to disclose their location for at least some period of time. Therefore, the court concluded, any wrong occurred when the federal officials first undertook to conceal the family, an event that took place far more than six years before the complaint was filed (*ibid.*).

The court of appeals held that Leonhard's claim was time-barred for another reason as well. On the basis of the complaint and Rochelle's affidavit, which petitioners submitted for purposes of this litigation (Pet. App. A-18), the court found that Rochelle and the children received no government assistance after July 1970 (*id.* at A-35 & n.20). Therefore, the last act of wrongful concealment charged by petitioners occurred in 1970, again more than six years before the complaint was filed (*id.* at A-34 to A-36).

The court of appeals also held that the children's constitutional allegations against the federal respondents failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted (Pet. App. A-42 to A-48). The court observed (*id.* at A-45):

> The most critical fact in determining whether the rights of the children were violated is the fact that Rochelle had sole custody of them. She was the parent who had been entrusted with their care, their educa-

> tion, their health and safety. There is no question that Rochelle consented to the removal and concealment of the children, nor that they remained in her custody for the entire time that they were concealed from their father.

Moreover, there could be no doubt that the federal officials acted reasonably and in an effort both to combat organized crime and to protect the children (*id.* at A-45 to A-46). Such officials, the court said, "must be entitled to rely on the consents of the family members to be removed and concealed" (*id.* at A-46). Since the children were not of age, the officials properly relied on the fact that Rochelle, the parent who had custody, had consented for them (*ibid.*).

Finally, the court of appeals upheld the dismissal of petitioners' tort claims—principally that the federal respondents had allowed the children to be injured in various ways by Calabrese (Pet. App. A-51 to A-60). The court held that these claims might well be time-barred, in whole or in part, by the children's failure to file administrative claims within two years of the alleged tortious acts, as required by 28 U.S.C. 2401(b) (Pet. App. A-55 to A-56). In any event, the court concluded, the federal respondents had not compelled the children to live with Calabrese and had not undertaken any duty to protect the children against Calabrese (*id.* at A-57 to A-58), nor was such a duty imposed by statute (*id.* at A-52 to A-54).[4]

ARGUMENT

1. The substance of petitioners' claims is that the federal respondents violated the Constitution by interfering with the relationship between the children and their natural

---

[4]The court of appeals also affirmed the dismissal as to the state respondents. It held that Leonhard's claims were time-barred (Pet. App. A-36 to A-39) and that the children's claims were barred by the Eleventh Amendment or failed to state a valid claim (*id.* at A-49 to A-51).

father. These contentions were rejected by the district court and the court of appeals in *Leonhard I*, and this Court declined to grant review. *Leonhard* v. *Richardson*, 412 U.S. 949 (1973). The district court and the court of appeals, in another thorough opinion, have again rejected the claims. There is no greater reason at this time for the Court to reconsider these holdings in this highly unusual case.

Moreover, as the courts below held, petitioners' claims are without merit. They are conclusively answered, as the court of appeals emphasized, by the fact that Rochelle, the parent who had legal custody of the children, consented to, and often insisted upon, every action by federal officials in issue here. The Leonhards' divorce, not the actions of federal officials, ruptured the relationship between Leonhard and the children. After the divorce, Rochelle, as custodian of the children, necessarily had the power to take a variety of actions that might affect the children's relationship with their natural father.

Federal officials did not require Rochelle to establish a new identity for the children, to move the children, to refuse to tell Leonhard where the children were, or to refuse to allow Leonhard to see them. On the contrary, respondent Kennelly, by forwarding mail between Leonhard and Rochelle, enabled her to put Leonhard in contact with the children at any time. The federal officials' only role was to make available to the family of a witness against organized crime the facilities that the family needed to protect itself against retaliation. As petitioners have conceded (Pet. App. A-45 to A-46), every action taken by federal officials was part of a good-faith effort to combat organized crime. It is implausible to suggest that federal officials violate the Constitution, or commit a tort, whenever they take action that has the incidental effect of allowing a divorced parent with custody of children to make it more difficult for the other parent to exercise his visitation rights.

In addition, as the court of appeals pointed out, this Court held, in *Parham* v. *J.R.*, 442 U.S. 584 (1979), that a decision by a responsible parent, if joined in by the appropriate state officials, can justify committing a child to a state mental hospital—a "more drastic intrusion" on the child's liberty than the relocation of the children in this case (Pet. App. A-47 to A-48). "[*A*]*fortiori* children have no cause to complain when their custodial parent and the government officials charged with such functions decide to protect their safety by relocating and concealing them, with their parent" (*id.* at A-48; footnote omitted).[5]

2. The courts below also correctly held that petitioners' claims are time-barred (Pet. App. A-30 to A-36, A-67).[6] The complaint, read together with Rochelle's affidavit, establishes

---

[5]Petitioners' damages claims against the federal officials are also barred by immunity doctrines. The district court so held (Pet. App. A-67) and the court of appeals did not reach the issue (*id.* at A-30 n.17). This Court's decisions have "emphasized * * * that, at least in the absence of some showing of malice, an official would not be held liable in damages * * * unless the constitutional right he was alleged to have violated was 'clearly established' at the time of the violation." *Butz* v. *Economou*, 438 U.S. 478, 498 (1978). If a "constitutional right allegedly violated had not been authoritatively declared at the time the * * * officials acted, the officials [are] entitled, as a matter of law, to prevail on their claim of qualified immunity." *Baker* v. *McCollan*, 443 U.S. 137, 139 (1979). In *Leonhard I*, the courts essentially declared that the rights petitioners asserted did not exist. In any event, no argument can be made that these rights were "clearly established." Federal officials' immunity against tort claims is, if anything, stronger. Compare *Barr* v. *Matteo*, 360 U.S. 564 (1959), with *Butz* v. *Economou*, *supra*, 438 U.S. at 495. Finally, the tort claims against the United States appear to be barred by the discretionary function exception to the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. 2680(a).

[6]In addition, as the district court held (Pet. App. A-66 to A-70), Leonhard's claims are barred by res judicata or collateral estoppel. The finding in *Leonhard I* that the federal officials violated no duty to Leonhard by refusing to disclose the location of his children precludes liability under any theory Leonhard advances in this second action against the same and additional federal officers.

that the federal respondents took no action to help conceal the children after July 1970. Thus, by petitioners' own account, the wrongful conduct had ceased by that time. The complaint was filed approximately eight years later, far beyond the applicable limitations period.

For the same reasons, the courts below were correct in holding that petitioners' claims under the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. 1346(b), 2671-2680, are barred by their failure to file administrative claims within the two-year period prescribed by 28 U.S.C. 2401(b). The administrative claims were filed on June 27, 1977 (Pet. App. A-56), more than two years after the federal officials' last act. In addition, Rochelle and the children ceased living with Calabrese in June 1975 (*ibid.*).

Petitioners' assertion that the "federal concealment doctrine" (Pet. 15) saves their claim is insubstantial. As the case cited by petitioners, *Briley* v. *California*, 564 F. 2d 849, 855 (9th Cir. 1977), itself shows, that doctrine applies where a *claim* has been concealed from a plaintiff by a defendant's action. Similarly, in *United States* v. *Kubrick*, 444 U.S. 111 (1979), another case cited by petitioners, this Court held that a claim "accrues" within the meaning of the Federal Tort Claims Act "when the plaintiff knows both the existence and the cause of his injury." *Id.* at 113. Here, Leonhard's children may have been concealed, but his claim—and the federal officials' role—were certainly not; indeed, he sued federal officials on substantially the same claim in 1971.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted.

WADE H. MCCREE, JR.
Solicitor General

THOMAS S. MARTIN
Acting Assistant Attorney General

ANTHONY J. STEINMEYER
Attorney

MARCH 1981